
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>



Stanford University Libraries



36105037033656

STUDY IN
SOCIALISM

ELDER



A STUDY IN SOCIALISM

BY
BENEDICT ELDER
//

ST. LOUIS, MO., 1915
PUBLISHED BY B. HERDER
17 SOUTH BROADWAY

FREIBURG (BADEN)
GERMANY

68, GREAT RUSSELL STR.
LONDON, W. C.

H X 86
E 45

PD. 3.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 29. Sept. 1915.

*F. G. Holweck,
Censor Librorum.*

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 1. Oct. 1915.

*✠ Joannes J. Glennon,
Archiepiscopus,
Sti. Ludovici.*

*Copyright, 1915,
by
Joseph Gummersbach*

All rights reserved

Printed in U. S. A.

INTRODUCTION

I. SOCIALISM

What is Socialism?

"I know if you do not ask me," said St. Augustine, when asked: What is Time? Most of us feel that we know what Socialism is until we begin to define it. It may be called a modern social phenomenon. It springs from modern industrial conditions as they are combined with the more modern phases of sentiment and thought. A more particular definition would only invite criticism and dispute. Socialists themselves are not agreed on a definition. One says it is a religious movement,¹ another a moral movement,² another, a humanitarian movement.³ In the *Communist Manifesto* it is termed a "proletarian movement," in the Chicago platform, a "purely economic movement," in the Gotha and Erfurt Programs and other official utterances in Europe and America, a revolutionary movement, a political movement, a working-class movement, a movement for the abolition of classes, for better working conditions, for social justice, for the emancipation of labor, etc., etc.

Then again, Socialism is defined to be not a movement but a principle,⁴ and again not merely a principle but a science.⁵ Frederick Engels says that it is a "complete

¹ *Socialism and Primitive Christianity*, Brown, 4.

² Geo. D. Herron, *Metropolitan*, August, 1913.

³ *The Passing of Capitalism*, Ladoff, 53.

⁴ *The Substance of Socialism*, Spargo, 84.

⁵ Ladoff, *op. cit.*, 39.

system of philosophy, mental, moral, natural and historical.”⁶ Another says it is a “complete system of thought with regard to human society and social progress.”⁷ Untermann says briefly that it is a “general key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe.”⁸ It is doubtless in contemplation of this illimitable character of Socialism that Ladoff exclaims: “To be a true Socialist is the highest distinction a man can attain on earth.”

In the book, *What Is Socialism*, written by R. G. Kauffman, one rightly expects to find a fairly adequate definition. But after devoting some fifteen thousand words to the task of showing that Socialism is a kind of political economy, calculated especially to benefit the working class, the writer opens his third chapter by saying: “I have said that Socialism, though expressing itself politically, is an economic force. Do not suppose, however, that the dyed-in-the-wool Socialist stops there. He has not been content until he has sought to discover a reason for his being, he has reconstructed his entire cosmos and the net consequence is a philosophy that embraces the whole body of art and morality,—embraces, indeed, all history and all life.” “It may be convenient for Socialists,” says E. Belfort Bax, “with a view to election expediency, to seek to confine the definition of Socialism to the economic issue. But the attempt to limit the term Socialism within the four walls of an economic definition is in the long run futile.”⁹

⁶ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 10.

⁷ *Industrial Socialism*, Haywood and Bohn, 55.

⁸ *Science and Revolution*, 127.

⁹ *Essays in Socialism*, quoted by Kauffman, *op. cit.*, 64. Cf. also, Ladoff, *op. cit.*, 39; *The Socialist Movement*, Vail, 2.

But, whether it is the result of misapprehension, or of tactical design, there is in Socialist propaganda a great number of definitions that plainly show an effort to confine the term Socialism "within the four walls of an economic." Deville says: "Socialism is the theoretical expression of the contemporaneous phase of the *economic* evolution of humanity."¹⁰ Another Socialist says: "Socialism is not a consequence of dreams any more than a certain type of plant. It is a product of economic evolution, a child of economic necessity."¹¹ "Socialism," says another, "is naught but Darwinism *economized*, made definite, applied to the economic conditions of human society."¹² Edward Bernstein defines Socialism as "the movement toward, or the actual existence of, the co-operative organization of society."¹³ Gaylord Wiltshire says, "It is the governmental ownership and management of capital and the co-operative distribution of the product of the workers."¹⁴ Morris Hillquit says it is "summed up" in the program that "requires the public or collective ownership and operation of the principal instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth," and he adds: "Whoever accepts this program is a Socialist, whoever does not, is not." Finally, there is one definition that may be found generally set out in Socialist propaganda: "Socialism is the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange."

¹⁰ *Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism*, 3.

¹¹ *Industrial Problems*, Richardson, 225.

¹² Preface to *Socialism and Positive Science*, MacDonald.

¹³ Quoted by Cathrein, *Socialism*, Eng. trans., 19.

¹⁴ *Why a Woman Should be a Socialist*, 17.

An English critic of Socialism says: "Socialists are agreed on one proposition and only one. They are all united in asserting that the 'socialization of the means of production, distribution and exchange' would provide a universal panacea for the ills of society."¹⁵ But they are not agreed on the meaning of this definition; they differ as to what socialization is and they differ as to the means that are to be socialized. "Their unity," says De Tunzleman, "resembles the unity existing among quacks who advertise pills that cure all ills. They are agreed that pills will cure all ills, but each maintains that they must be his own pills."

We have said that Socialism is a modern social phenomenon; but what are its principles? what is its history? and what are its aims? The three divisions of this book are devoted to answering these questions. The "Principles" of Socialism are considered first. They are set out in the language of Socialists, taken first hand from the writings of acclaimed leaders and teachers of Socialism in this and other countries.¹⁶ They are subjected to the light of reason and of truth: of reason admitting first principles; of truth in its own objectivity. There is such truth: science, religion, morals is rooted in such truth; human life in all its bearings comes in contact with it constantly, and only by its conscious or unconscious recognition is man more than an automaton. If it seems a reflection upon the intelligence of almost every one to call attention to truths that are axiomatic, there is a rea-

¹⁵ *The Superstition Called Socialism*, De Tunzleman, 84.

¹⁶ Wherever quotations appear without a reference, they will be found quoted elsewhere in this study with proper references.

son: Socialist fundamentals contradict them; and Socialism is accepted by many sincere people. So if this study is to serve any purpose as an antidote for Socialist teaching, it must bring before the mind those first truths whose neglect caused that teaching to be accepted. In the book, *Outcome of Philosophy*, by J. Dietzgen, it is said: "The universe is an organism and the infinite cause and effect of everything, including itself."¹⁷ Marx used to refer to Dietzgen as "our philosopher." Of course, to think of anything as being the cause of itself, or the effect of itself, or both the cause and the effect of anything, is to think in contradictory terms. In a paper communicated to the Socialist International Congress of 1865, Marx wrote: "We begin by saying that the value of labor determines the value of commodities and we wind up by saying that the value of commodities determines the value of labor. Here we come to a standstill. Of course, to a standstill if we try to reason logically." He said again, that his "explanation of the source of profits is a paradox and contrary to everyday observation and experience." Yet, he did not hesitate, nor do his followers hesitate, to claim that his teachings are the last word in economic science, or in all science for that matter. These examples of the way in which Socialists disregard the fundamental laws of right thinking seem sufficient warrant for a study of Socialism to call attention to truths the acceptance of which is indispensable to the integrity of every teaching.

¹⁷ Cf. *Revolution a Science*, Untermann, 151, where it is said that Dietzgen "demonstrated" the absurd statement quoted and by that means "perfected his materialistic monism."

II. SOCIALISTS

Having shown by a first-hand study of its "Principles" what Socialism stands for, we next proceed to show what Socialists as a class have done. We present a panoramic view of the "History of Socialism," which includes a brief sketch of the development of the Idea, the Sentiment, and the Movement. The facts detailed are necessarily meagre and the outline must be incomplete in many respects. The Idea drawn out is not common to all Socialists without exception, and, hence, will draw the fire of some of them. This is true with respect to the Sentiment, also. And likewise as to the Movement. There are as many kinds of Socialists as there are many kinds of Socialism. There is the "cross-barred" Socialist, who is either in prison for committing a crime or is trying to break in by committing one; there is Ladoff's "Socialist-pure-and-simple," who claims he has nothing to do with religion or morals or the family; there is Kauffman's "dyed-in-the-wool" Socialist, who reconstructs his entire cosmos and all history and all life in the terms of Socialism. M. Hillquit sets out a program that requires public ownership of the means for producing wealth and says: "Whoever accepts this program is a Socialist; whoever does not, is not." The Socialist Party of the United States sets out another program, which requires "a new world out of the old," where everything will be changed, "the boots on people's feet, the clothing they wear, the houses they inhabit, the work they do, the education they get, their places, their honors and all their possessions . . . will have to undergo as complete a change as a caterpillar does when it becomes a

moth," and it says: "Unless you demand all this, unless you are prepared to fight for all this, you are not really a Socialist."¹

There is no unfailing test of Socialist adherence. Many believe in government ownership of certain industries, and some say they are Socialists, but the Socialist platform adopted at Rochester anxiously "warned the people against all public-ownership movements as an attempt of the capitalist class to secure governmental control of public utilities for the purpose of obtaining greater security in the exploitation of other industries." Many believe that modern industrial conditions call for shorter hours, higher wages, and better working conditions for laborers, and some say these are Socialists; but these reforms were agitated long before Socialism was known. The Craft Guilds of the Middle Ages were both zealous and efficient in promoting the welfare of the working classes. And long before the existence of the guilds there were unions active in the interests of the workers.² After the guilds had broken up, better hours, wages and working conditions continued to be agitated, and it is this agitation, expanded and grown, and not Socialism, that has brought about the labor legislation existing in various countries. Socialists, as a class, have contributed nothing to this legislation. In fact, where they have been in a position to take part in

¹ *Socialist Campaign Book*, 1908, compiled under the direction of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party (U. S.), 26, 27.

² Cf. M. Davidson's *Annals of Toil*, 6, where he mentions the discovery in the ruins of Pompeii of a placard announcing the nomination for public office of a member of a union.

the matter, they have opposed all measures looking to reform, because "Socialism is not a reform, but a revolution"; "it is not a remedy for the existing ills of society but a program for a new society." It is Socialist teaching that "no wage can ever be a just reward for a day's work,"³ that a general increase of wages is a detriment instead of a benefit to wage earners because "the power of the capitalist class over labor is increased, the social position of the laborer is deteriorated"; therefore, "the cry for a fair wage is an insane wish never to be fulfilled." And it is a Socialist tactic in most countries, though being only a tactic it does not obtain in all alike, that all reforms looking toward the betterment of the working man are to be voted down on the theory that they merely make the working classes more contented and thereby postpone the day when they will join in the Great Revolution. It is true, in the platforms of the Socialist parties there appear demands for certain reforms that would benefit the workers, but in all of those platforms, immediately following these demands, is the announcement: "Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism, are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government that they may lay hold of the entire system of industry and thus come into their rightful inheritance."

Some Socialists claim that the workers are entitled to the entire product of labor. Indeed, an official declaration of American Socialists is that they "propose to place the workers in possession of all they produce." Other Socialists say that before the workers are paid

³ *Industrial Problems*, Richardson, 31.

anything, there must be deducted "a portion to take the place of taxes, a portion to replace the labor consumed, one to extend the scale of production, one to insure against disasters, one to support the incapables, one for administration, one for sanitation, one for education, etc." ⁴ Then there are State Socialists, like Wells, Hillquit, and Spargo, who imagine there will be government and law and all the paraphernalia of State when Socialism is ushered in; and there are others, like Blatchford, who says: "No man who understands liberty, equality, fraternity, could live under State Socialism. It would be hell." There are "Christian" Socialists, who teach that Christ was the first Socialist; and there are others, who say He was a vagabond. And there are "Parlor" Socialists and "Revisionists" and "Opportunists" and "Impossibilists," and so forth.

This book, in the main, treats of Scientific Socialists, of their teaching, their history and their proposals. From their teaching we learn what Socialism is; from their history, what Socialists have done; and their teaching and their history combine to throw a true light upon what they propose to do. Their history must be considered in the light of human nature, which does not change. Socialists are used to regard human nature as changeable. "Is it possible to change human nature?" asks Ladoff, who recognizes that, unless it is changed, "history will repeat itself," and Socialists in the future, as they have in the past, will do nothing but stir up discontent and produce nothing but lawlessness and crime; and Ladoff answers himself: "This objection is by no means new. The man-eater certainly [?] did object in

⁴ *Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism*, Deville, 33.

the same way to the reformers who suggested that enslaving prisoners would be preferable to eating them ;” and he adds the statement that he will not further answer the question “because it would be too tedious.”⁵

But if human nature were not unchangeable, Socialism would surely effect a noticeable change in it. Are Socialists less human than are others? Have they no selfishness, envy, greed, inordinate ambition? Do harmony, peace, and good will everywhere rule among them? Are they distinguished for their works of charity, their deeds of mercy or justice, their honesty and good moral character? Do they excel in loyalty, love for law, respect for authority, in purity, integrity, and nobility of life and conduct? It is written: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” What have the Socialists done? How many hospitals have they built? how many schools endowed? how many orphans’ homes established? how many asylums for the afflicted? If we were treating of an ordinary political organization, such questions would be captious rather than critical. But when it is claimed that Socialism is a complete system of philosophy in its every phase,—“broad as humanity and deep as the mystery of life,”—“a key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe,”—“the only proposition for social order ever presented to the world,”—when it is claimed that this complete system of thought which embraces the entire cosmos and all history and all life, “is taught in more than sixty languages and accepted by more than thirty million persons,”—it is pertinent to ask what have Socialists as a class done during the more than sixty years since their movement took definite form?

⁵ *Passing of Capitalism*, 6.

III. SOCIALISDOM

In a series of debative letters exchanged some years ago between Robt. Rives La Monte, "Scientific Socialist," and H. L. Mencken, "Nietzschean Individualist," which have since been published under the title *Men vs. The Man*, La Monte criticises his opponent for using the expression "Under Socialism" in referring to a supposed society where Socialism is established. "Socialism is not an umbrella or an awning," says La Monte. This is mentioned by way of accounting for the use in this work of a word of our own making,—*Socialisdom*, which is used in the sense of the society wherein Socialism must cease to be mere theory and be put into actual practice.

If the principles of Socialism must be made to harmonize with reason and truth, and its history must be judged in the light of human nature, with equal necessity its aims must be subjected to the test of practicability. It is a common objection that Socialism is impossible. This applies in particular to its basic proposals. They are not impossible in the absolute sense of the term, perhaps, but they are practically impossible. Instead of using the word impossible in this connection, the more precise critic says impracticable. To this the Socialists retort that the same thing was said about nearly all modern improvements, that it is the stock-in-trade objection of the reactionary and was urged against popular government, universal education, steam and electric appliances, transcontinental railroads, irrigation and reclamation projects in the great West, and so forth, and that it is entitled to no more weight when urged against Socialism

than it was when urged against these and other ventures that are now achievements. But there is a difference. It is the Socialist proposals themselves, and not the means for applying them, that are impracticable. They are contrary to reason, to truth, to human experience. They are contrary to nature and the laws of nature. They are contrary to each other. Hence, they are not merely impractical, they are impracticable. It is not that they would be difficult, tedious, trying, expensive, tyrannical, unjust, in their operation;—they cannot be put into operation. Such is the meaning of those who are careful to say only that Socialism is impracticable, and such is the meaning generally intended in this study when it is said to be impossible. The latter term is here employed because in its popular acceptation the term impracticable does not convey the meaning intended, and to the popular mind, which is not exactly critical, that meaning can be conveyed only by use of the term impossible.

It should be borne in mind, however, that we are treating of only the essential aims of Socialism, such as the “abolition of the State, the atrophy of religion, the metamorphosis of the family, the destruction of property,” and the erection upon the ruin thus made of a society where “idleness or selfishness or sin will be unknown,” where “all will have plenty and be content and the sweet spirit of Comradeship will blossom forth like the fabled rose of unchanging beauty.” With the demands Socialists set out in their platform “as measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim,” such as ownership of public utilities, conservation of natural resources, industrial in-

surance, old-age pensions, equal suffrage, initiative, referendum and recall, this study is not concerned. They are no part of Scientific Socialism. Not only are they extraneous to Socialism, they are inconsistent with it, and while in civilization they are for the most part practicable and even practical, not to say judicious, they would not be possible in Socialisdom. This fact must not be overlooked. Those who take up Socialism must abandon Civilization. Those who desire the advent of Socialisdom must be willing to give up Civilization. There is no way to combine the two. There is no looking back for the Scientific Socialist, who is the only Socialist worthy of the name.

Ibsen wrote a play called *The Doll's House*. In it he describes Nora as growing tired of her husband and his home and his people, and as leaving them "without taking anything, and without sending back." She broke completely with the old life and thenceforth "took nothing from strangers," as all in the old life were considered to be. This is Ibsen's strong point. Nora was happy because her life was new out and out. In *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, La Monte seizes on Nora's act to illustrate his estimate of a Socialist, who, like Nora, if he would be content, can take nothing, not even jewels from strangers, but must break entirely with civilization and center all his hopes, all his aspirations, all his ideals in Socialism. The casual reader of Socialist literature is apt to miss this point because all Socialists are not so frank as La Monte, who does not hesitate to head a chapter of his book "The Nihilism of Socialism," nor to write up to the mark suggested. One cannot be too wary of Socialist tactics. Whether dealing with their

principles, their history or their aims, one will find on examination and comparison that the Socialists are past-masters in the art of thimble-rigging. The unvarying hue of their dark fortunes (except of their leaders who have capitalized the delusions of their "comrades" to become rich) has schooled them in the ways of cleverness and cunning, and there is scarcely any class of people upon which their fine play of words and of sentiment does not have some effect. Their writings are both varied and voluminous, and they make a show of learning that is wholly deceptive. There are few known subjects of which they do not treat, and there is not one they treat that they do not assume to say the last word about. Where scientists have doubts, the Socialists are certain; where statesmen hesitate, they go ahead; where angels fear to tread, they rush in. Their audacity is almost beyond belief. They claim to be able to solve "all the riddles of the universe" by their philosophy, and when their society comes, "there will be nothing that the human heart can long for that it will not get, and nothing that the human mind can conceive that it will not understand."

Why do people believe these extravagant claims? They do not believe them. They are captured by Socialist tactics. Spargo writes his *Bitter Cry of the Children*, and they seem to hear the piteous wail; London publishes his *Iron Heel*, and they seem to feel the crushing weight; Hunter portrays the life of misery in *Poverty*, and this picture stirs their deepest emotions. Millions of copies of these writings are circulated each year, and for the most part are read by people who do not know "how the other half of the world lives" and

who respond with feeling, or by others who do not care what comes if they can only "get even" with the hated capitalist; they respond with feeling too, but of a different kind; their aim is to do anything that will injure the man above them; Socialism promises "the deep damnation of his taking off," and therefore, they are Socialists. But the feeling of the others, whose hearts are touched by the cry of suffering, though different, is wrought up by the same tactic; they think in the lurid light of what they read and their aim to do something for suffering humanity becomes desperate and they grow indifferent to consequences, imagining that the worst cannot be worse than what is pictured to them. They do not consider that for centuries, the best minds and the purest hearts have been devoted to bettering the conditions they deplore, and have been fairly successful, and but for visionary ideas of the future or pessimistic ideas of the present, they would be more successful; they do not consider that the poor are always with us, and that it is the poor in spirit, the humble, the clean of heart, who "will see God." They hear this cry of suffering sounded by Socialists, coming from the lips of little children, from the anguished hearts of mothers, from the echo of sweat-drops as they fall from the brows of broken men upon their luckless labor; they hear it on the winds of fortune, as it mingles with the sounds of riches, revelry, and debauching, and they are swept off the rock of understanding by the wave of sympathy that surges over them. Not reflecting that this life is only a preparation for happiness, and if it could be itself happiness there would be no need of a life to come, not distinguishing between heaven and earth, their souls are

stirred, and they respond with spirit to the cry of the Socialists: "There is no justice! Our civilization is perverted! Sweep away! Destroy! Turn back the wheels of Time and begin over!" This is the spirit that makes for Socialism,—discontent, noble or ignoble; recklessness; desperation! This is why it is of the utmost importance to consider in detail what Socialisdom will be and how it would meet the practical problems of a civilized and progressing society.

For there is no doubt that society is progressing. It is progressing among all classes, though perhaps not among some so much as they deserve. And if it cannot be demonstrated that it will progress more rapidly in Socialisdom, none but the malcontents of society will cry out for the change. We speak of progress chiefly in the sense that it is an expansion and growth of the spirit of love—for God and fellowman. In this dual spirit we write. Who does not read in a like spirit might as well stop, for to leave God or humanity out of the equation of the universe is to unseat reason from its throne and make of all thought, all desire and all effort, things but of folly and despair.

PREFACE

This book is the first of a contemplated series which will treat of modern social evils and their correction. That injustice and wrong largely characterize present day industrial conditions is too plain to be denied, too serious to be ignored.

Socialism is to-day the most conspicuous proposal looking to a betterment of these conditions, and its teachings and their bearing, therefore, are properly of first consideration in this series. The attitude of the writer toward Socialism is frankly hostile,—so much the reader is entitled now to know,—but it may not be doubted that the criticism and protest of Socialist propaganda have done much to bring about certain wholesome reforms begun in the last quarter-century.

The numbers of the series which are to follow will deal more directly with the principal social ills, pointing out the chief causes as well as the occasions for their existence and suggesting possible means of getting rid of them. Each number, like this one, will be arranged in chapters and sections with the view of being easily adapted to the uses of a text book. A list of authorities is appended for the convenience of those who would make a more thorough study of the subject, and a full index follows for ready reference.

Quite a number of persons have assisted me in the

PREFACE

preparation of this work, and though their modesty is such that I may not name them this acknowledgement cannot be unwelcome when it is so cheerfully and gratefully made.

BENEDICT ELDER.

Louisville, Kentucky
October 15, 1915.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

	PAGE
I Socialism	iii
II Socialists	viii
III Socialisdom	xiii

FIRST PART

(By sections)

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE ECONOMIC PRINCIPLE

I Value	3
II Surplus Value	8
III The Class Struggle	10
IV Ownership	13
V Objections:	15
1. The root fallacy	15
2. The practical folly	17
3. The social injustice	18
4. The surplus value bogey	21
5. The impossible class struggle	23
6. The collectivist fatality	25

CHAPTER TWO

THE PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLE

I Method	27
II Content	30

CONTENTS

	PAGE
III Theory of the Universe	33
IV "Economic Determinism"	40
V Summary and Analysis	46

CHAPTER THREE

THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE

I Godlessness	49
II Humanitarianism	52
III Hostile Attitude	54
IV Malicious Attitude	57
V Religion and Socialism Contrasted	60
1. Natural Religion	61
2. Revealed Religion	62
3. Christianity	63

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MORAL PRINCIPLE

I Morals Distinguished from Ethics	67
II Free Will a Condition of Morality	68
III End of Man the Basis of Morality	70
IV Socialist Conception of Morality	73
V The Moral Law of Socialism	81

CHAPTER FIVE

THE POLITICAL PRINCIPLE

I Civil Authority	87
II The State	91
III Civil Law	100

CHAPTER SIX

THE SOCIAL PRINCIPLE

I Sociality	114
-----------------------	-----

CONTENTS

	PAGE
II Social Classes	116
III Class-consciousness	119

SECOND PART THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE IDEA

I Platonic	135
II Utopian	142
III "Scientific"	151
IV Practical	159

CHAPTER TWO

THE SENTIMENT	163
-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER THREE

THE MOVEMENT

I Formative Period	178
II The "International"	188
III National Parties	193
1. Germany	193
2. England	198
3. United States	203

THIRD PART THE AIMS OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

AS A THOUGHT MOVEMENT

I In Philosophy	219
II In Religion	223
III In Morals	226

CONTENTS

CHAPTER TWO

	PAGE
AS A POLITICAL MOVEMENT	
I Revolution	229
1. A Criticism	233
II Reconstruction	236
1. As to what the State must acquire ownership in	238
2. As to how acquisition by the State is effected .	246
(a) A Comment	251

CHAPTER THREE

AS AN ECONOMIC MOVEMENT	
I The Operation of Industry	254
1. As to the Division of Labor	256
2. As to the Direction of Labor	263
II The Distribution of Goods	270
1. As to the Needs of Society	271
2. "To Each According to His Needs"	274
3. "From Each According to His Ability"	275
(a) A Suggestion	277

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

STATEMENT	
I Value	291
II Surplus Value	292
III The Class Struggle	292
IV The System	292
V The Remedy	293
REFUTATION	294
AUTHORITIES	301
INDEX	319

FIRST PART
THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

A STUDY IN SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE ECONOMIC PRINCIPLE

I. VALUE

The Socialist principle of economics lies at the root of Socialist philosophy. This principle is variously defined and described, and variously illustrated by Socialists; but with due consideration for diversity of expression and of detail, it is fairly summed up in the Marxian formula: Labor is the source of all value.¹

As employed in this formula, the term value has a meaning quite distinct from that commonly accepted. It here signifies, not utility or desirability, but merely an exchange characteristic. It does not belong to things in general, but only to commodities. The distinction made by Socialists between products and commodities more fully elucidates their use of the term value. A commodity is an article produced for purposes of ex-

¹ Though it has come to be identified with the teachings of Karl Marx, the principle set out in the formula was clearly held by Ricardo. It perhaps was first suggested by Smith (*Wealth of Nations*, 37), but only as obtaining in the very earliest stages of civilization.

change. An article produced for consumption without exchange is simply a product. Not being designed for use, but for exchange, a commodity has no use characteristic. Likewise, not being designed for exchange, a product has no exchange characteristic. Value is an exchange characteristic. It is that characteristic in an article offered for exchange by which the article to be received in exchange is measured.²

With this understanding of the restricted sense in which the term value is used, we can follow the Socialist argument, which perhaps is best presented by an illustration. Suppose that the owner of a wheat surplus, which on account of its being a surplus, is meant for exchange, and is, therefore, a commodity, wishes to receive furniture, clothes, implements, live stock, for each of which commodities he offers a certain quantity of wheat. In each case he demands an equivalent for what he offers. The diversity of these commodities is such that a common measure or comparison of the things themselves is not possible. Some characteristic must be found that is alike embodied in all of them, so that by comparing the quantity of this characteristic embodied in one commodity with a more or less quantity embodied in another, their relative values may be determined. This common characteristic is labor. Nothing but labor is alike necessary to all commodities. Hence, labor is the only common denominator as it were, in the com-

² Marx (*Capital*, 2-5), distinguishes between "use-value" and "exchange-value." By the first term, he means simply utility; by the second, value in the sense of the text: "Exchange-value is the only form in which VALUE can manifest itself or be expressed."

modities of the world, and it is consequently the source and the determinant of all value.³

As used in the Marxian formula, also, the term labor has a distinctive meaning. Among the earlier Socialists there appears a tendency to restrict the meaning of this term to manual labor; but the Socialists of the present time, following the later utterances of Marx, enlarge its meaning to include the various human functions ordinarily exercised in the production of commodities. The extension of the scope of this term has obviated many serious difficulties that Socialist apologists formerly encountered. Other difficulties remain, however, and to meet these, Socialists reverse the process and restrict the meaning of the term labor to what they call "social labor." The necessity for this appears from the fact that not infrequently commodities of the same kind and of equal quantity embody different amounts of labor. Take two tons of coal, one of which was mined hundreds of feet under-ground and the other gathered from an out-crop. It cannot in truth be said that the former, which embodies much more labor than the latter, is of a much greater value. Now if both tons, though embodying vastly different amounts of labor, are of equal value, this fact vitiates the Socialist formula. To meet this difficulty, Socialists make use of the term, social labor, and distinguish it from waste labor and "gratuitous service."

Social labor is defined as the sum of human effort that under average social conditions is necessary to produce a given commodity. Where, by reason of igno-

³ The illustration is adapted from Chas. H. Vail's *Principles of Scientific Socialism*.

rance, lack of skill, aversion to modern methods, or the like, one expends more labor in the production of a commodity than is ordinarily necessary, it is reckoned a waste of labor,—as where one would dig into the earth for coal when there was an abundance on the surface. On the other hand, where a commodity is produced with less labor than is ordinarily necessary, it is deemed an instance of gratuitous service,—as where one would find an out-cropping when coal was generally being mined from under-ground. Neither waste labor nor gratuitous service, but only social labor, is reckoned in the value of a commodity. Hence, the two tons of coal instanced, though embodying different quantities of actual labor, are of equal value because they represent equal quantities of social labor.⁴

Socialists find yet another distinction to be necessary to make their theory plausible. Neither the quality nor the intensity, but only the duration of labor can be measured. Therefore, quality and intensity must be eliminated from the characteristics of labor as it goes to make up value. To do this without seeming to vitiate their principle, Socialists differentiate labor and labor-power. Labor is ordinarily regarded as a commodity that is bought and sold as other commodities; but it is obvious, say the Socialists, that it is not labor itself that is bought and sold on the markets, for before it is expended it does not exist and after it is expended it is crystallized in the commodity produced, which ordinarily belongs to the capitalist instead of the laborer, therefore, it is proper to consider labor-power and not labor as the

⁴ Cf. *Value, Price and Profit*, Marx, 56 et seq.

commodity.⁵ Being a commodity, labor-power has a value, which like the value of all other commodities, is determined by the labor necessary to its production, that is to say, by the labor embodied in the commodities consumed in the production of the labor-power.⁶ One kind of labor-power differs in value from another kind, not because it is a different kind, either in quality or intensity, but only because it required different amounts of what may be broadly termed "the necessities of life" to produce them.⁷ If it requires \$1000 worth of commodities to develop a plain workman, \$3000 for a mechanic and \$10,000 for an artist, the labor-power of the mechanic would be three times that of the workman in value and that of the artist ten times that of the workman. The workman need only perform three units of labor-time to equal one of the mechanic and ten to equal one of the artist. Thus, labor is freed from all such characteristics as quality and intensity and reduced to a common product, measurable in time units of hours, days or weeks.⁸

⁵ Cf. Deville's *Socialism, Internationalism and Revolution*, 15; also, Marx's *Value, Price and Profit*, 73.

⁶ "Thus," says Marx (*op. cit.*), "we begin by saying that the value of labor determines the value of commodities and we conclude by saying that the value of commodities determines the value of labor."

⁷ "Skilled labor," says Marx (*Capital*, 7), "counts only as simple labor multiplied, a given quantity of skilled being equal to a greater quantity of unskilled labor. For simplicity's sake we account every kind of labor simple labor."

⁸ Vail says (*op. cit.*, 43): "One hour's work of the artist, say, represents 5 units, and that of the hod-carrier, one. Thus all concrete labor can be reduced to units of abstract labor measurable in time units of hours, days or weeks. The same is true of

Socialists seem to be very sure that their ingenuity has thus met every objection to be urged against their theory of value, and that with the distinctions noted thoroughly understood, this theory is the only correct basis upon which to build a scientific scheme of political economy. Before undertaking to point out other objections that seem to us valid, it may be well first to note the bearings of this theory on other Socialist theories of economics.

II. SURPLUS-VALUE

It is said that an understanding of the theory of Surplus-Value is the beginning of Socialist knowledge.¹ Without a doubt, this theory is of the most radical importance to Socialism. It is the working theory of the Socialist movement. Although somewhat tedious to define, with the aid of practical illustrations it can be grasped quite readily.

Surplus-value is the product of surplus labor. Surplus labor is the labor exerted over and above that which is necessary to restore the labor-power exhausted. If a man produces enough of "the necessities of life" to last professional labor. Quality is thus reduced to quantity." Cf. also, *Socialism from Genesis to Revelation*, Sprague, 61. It is after fully developing this idea that Vail declares (91) that "Under Socialism, vouchers for labor would take the place of money. For every day's labor a certificate would be issued against the wealth created, which would exchange for any commodity containing that amount of labor-time."

¹ Cf. *Industrial Socialism*, 56. Perhaps the plainest statement of this theory to be found in Socialist literature appears in Marx's *Value, Price and Profit*, 75, sqq. Cf. also, *Capital*, 128, sqq. Marx no doubt derived the idea of Surplus-Value from the English writers, Godwin, Hall, and Thompson, but he does not appear to have given them the credit.

him one day by working only two hours, then the value of his labor-power for a day is equivalent to two hours of work. For that man two hours of work each day is "necessary labor;" all the work he does over that is surplus labor, which produces surplus value.

Since it is a commodity, labor-power has a value, and this value is determined by the labor worked up in the "necessities" consumed in developing the labor-power. But, though its *value* is thus definitely limited, the *use* of the labor-power is limited only by the strength, skill, and energy of the laborer. Having produced the value of his labor-power he may continue to work until his ability is exhausted, but in such a case, all that he produces during the over-time is surplus value. To one not practiced in the vagaries of Socialistic expression, this will appear more simple by considering that the value of labor-power is equivalent to cost. Therefore, when the cost has been replaced by the use of the labor-power for a given time, whatever further use is made of it results in profit. Surplus value, therefore, is equivalent to profit.²

² "Out of it," says a Socialist writer (N. A. Richardson, *Industrial Problems*, 21), "are paid all dividends, interest, rents, and profits. It supports tens of thousands wholesale and retail establishments. It builds the railways, business blocks, factories, highways and mansions of the nation. It furnishes the blood and sinew of an industrial tyranny." "It is unpaid labor," says another (Geo. D. Herron, *Revolution to Revolution*, 13), "that towers in the steeples of our churches, that sits in our legislatures, that builds palaces in our avenues, that blossoms in our fashions, that drones in our academies, that produces our novels and our poetry and sings in Kipling's brute heroics. Our civilization and all the civilizations that have been, are but institutional-

Socialist propagandists usually define surplus value as *unpaid* labor. When an employer hires labor-power, he pays for its *value*, that is, sufficient to maintain it. But by paying for its value for one day, he acquires the right to *use* it, not only for such time as is necessary to reproduce its value, but for the entire day. If it reproduces its value in two hours, and the employer uses it for ten hours, he gets eight hours of labor for which he does not pay. This is what Socialists mean when they say that the workingman is "robbed" by his employer of about 80% of his wages.³ The employer is the "capitalist" of society. He hires labor-power at its value, but extracts from it all the use of which it is capable, and thus realizes out of the mere incident of relation between employer and employe an indefensible profit by means of which he constantly and systematically increases the advantage of his position. From this idea, another Socialist theory is begotten.

III. THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Socialists teach that society is divided into two great classes, the class that produces and the class that consumes surplus value, the working class and the capitalist class. The interests, the aims, and the hopes of these
ized unpaid labor, conventionalized robbery of the common labor of mankind."

³ Debs says (*Life, Writings and Speeches*, 428): "The worker receives only about 17% of the product of his labor and is robbed of 83%." Another Socialist authority (*National Office Bulletin*, No. 14) puts it exactly at 87.52%. These figures are based on the total output of the several industries, and do not allow for cost of maintenance, taxes, insurance, rents, interest, and the like, to say nothing of dividends and profits.

two classes are diametrically opposed, and no sort of reform measures can do away with this conflicting character. The working class is entitled to all it produces: "If the workingman is not entitled to all he produces, who is?" asks Debs in his catch-penny way of speaking. Of course, the realization of this idea means the utter destruction of the capitalist class, which the Socialist platform declares has "no right to be." Here, we have a deadly conflict, on one side or the other of which is ranged every member of society. This class-conflict has been going on ever since, in the course of his advancement, man's productive capacity began to outrun the cost of his maintenance. It will continue until the capitalist class is destroyed. Its intensity may be diminished, as in the past it has been, by revolution or reform; it may at times seem almost to pass away, owing to changes in the mode of production or in the capitalist base of exploitation; but withal, the conflict between workingmen and capitalists is an inherent conflict that can cease only when one or the other class has been removed from society. During the centuries past, the struggle on the part of the working class has been more instinctive than intelligent, and for this reason, notwithstanding its greater numbers, it has been unable to throw off the oppression of the capitalists. Indeed, the great numbers of the workers, each of which is a unit producing surplus value for the benefit of the capitalist class, has only served to make the oppression more grievous. But, thanks to Socialism, the working class is rapidly becoming more intelligent, and it is only a matter of time when all of its members will attain to "class-consciousness," when, instead of strengthening the position of the capi-

talists, as they now unwittingly do, they will overthrow and destroy them.¹

Such is the Socialist Class-struggle theory, which, in connection with the theory of surplus value, is diligently taught by all Socialist propagandists. Indeed, it may in truth be said that the immediate aim of all Socialist endeavor is to instill into the minds of certain classes of workingmen the belief that they are being systematically robbed by the capitalists and the conviction that they are powerful enough to put an end to this system, by force if necessary. The ultimate aim is the extinction of capitalists and capitalism, and whatever promises in the remotest degree to further this purpose is acceptable to Socialists. But the crowning device of their scheme to root out capitalism from civilization and lift the workman from his low estate, is that of public or collective ownership of the means for production, distribution, and exchange. The Socialist principle of economics begins with the theory of value; it ends with the theory of public or collective ownership.²

¹ Cf. Communist Manifesto (1848), Gotha (1875) and Erfurt (1891) Programs and the platforms of the Socialist Party of the United States, 1904, 1908, 1912. Nearly all Socialist propaganda sets out the Class-struggle theory at greater or lesser length, but one of the most succinct statements of it is that of G. Deville, of high Socialist repute, found in his booklet, *Socialism, Internationalism and Revolution*, 11. For another plain statement, cf. Kauffman's *What Is Socialism?* Chap. V, "War of the Classes."

² Cf. *Common Sense of Socialism*, John Spargo; *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, Morris Hillquit; *Evolution of Property*, Paul Lafargue; *Philosophy of Socialism* (an economic instead of a philosophic dissertation), A. M. Simons, all of which are widely read in Socialist circles.

IV. OWNERSHIP

Socialists hold that it is wrong for a man to own property he does not use, or use property he does not own. They say that what is personally used should be personally owned and what is collectively used should be collectively owned, for in this manner alone can the exploitation and robbery of labor be stopped. The prevailing system of ownership appears to them to violate justice in each of the particulars indicated. On the one hand some persons own much more than they can use; and on the other, many persons, in order barely to live, are required to use what they do not own. Socialists conceive that this system makes the user, the laborer, dependent upon the owner, the capitalist, and as a result of this dependency, the laborer is required to pay the capitalist a tribute, wrung from his hard toil, for the mere privilege of living by the use of another's property. This tribute may take the form of rent, interest, dividends or profits, which are only separate names for surplus value; but in any event it is taken from the product of labor. Hence, the Socialists say, the prevailing system of ownership, which entails the loss to labor of a part, and much the greater part, of its product, is manifestly contrary to justice.

To remedy this condition, Socialists propose that no person should own property that another person uses, and, so far as is possible, every person should own the property that he uses, while property that more than one uses is to be collectively owned. The object of Socialist ownership is to make it impossible for one person to acquire surplus value, or profit, dividend, interest or

rent, through the labor of another. But this can be accomplished only by making it impossible for one person to acquire the labor of another, and this, in turn, can be accomplished only by the public asserting ownership and control of all of the instruments for production and distribution that might be used by one person while owned by another.¹

The details of the theories of value, surplus value, the class struggle, and ownership,—which go to make up the Socialist principle of economics,—are bewildering in their number and variety, but the foregoing is a comprehensive and accurate outline. A striking feature of these theories is the continuity of thought that links them together. With a precision that all but justifies their use of the term scientific, Socialists refer the several phases of their principle of economics to its basic formula: Labor is the source of all value. If the principle thus broadly indicated be made to appear reasonable, Socialists, theoretically, can urge its minor divisions with considerable force. Labor being the source of all value, surplus labor must be the source of surplus value, and a struggle between classes for its control becomes inevitable, and collective ownership seems the only feasible plan that will afford relief. But if the proposition that

¹ As to precisely what property Socialists propose to own, we shall consider when treating of the "Aims of Socialism." The *reason* for the demand for collective ownership must not be lost sight of: "The making of goods for profit must come to an end" (Socialist platform (U. S.), 1904), because "no wage can ever be fair compensation for a day's work" (*Industrial Problems*, Richardson) and "the cry for a fair wage is an insane wish never to be fulfilled" (*Value, Price and Profit*, Marx).

labor is the source of all value be shown to be unreasonable, this very coherency of thought in Socialist economics is fatal in effect. This consideration has induced the postponement of the objections deemed pertinent, to the end that their bearing on the whole principle under discussion would be readily seen.

V. OBJECTIONS

1. *The root fallacy.*

The strength of the Socialist argument is the assumption that, in the course of exchange, the parties demand equivalents. This demand necessitates a measure of both that which is given and that which is received in exchange. To determine on this measure requires in all articles of exchange a common characteristic by which they can be measured. This common characteristic is found to be labor. The force of the entire argument is thus seen to depend upon the validity of the assumption that equal values are demanded by the parties to an exchange. If this be true, a unit of value that is common to all commodities must be found and it is difficult to imagine what could serve this purpose more nearly than labor. But if it be not true, then the whole structure of Socialist economics comes tumbling down like a house of cards.

On reflection, however, it is plain that the parties to an exchange do not demand equal values in the exchange. If they did there would be no reason for an exchange. Between commodities that are of equal value, and that have no other characteristic except value, there can be no intelligent choice and there can be no purposive ex-

change of them. The truth is that exchange occurs only when values are believed by both parties to be unequal. Each party prefers that which he acquires to that which he relinquishes in the exchange. The very inducement of the exchange is the belief on the part of each party that what he receives is more valuable to him than what he gives.

It should be borne in mind that Socialists do not allow that a commodity possesses any other than a value-characteristic so long as it is a commodity, which it certainly is at the time of the exchange; hence, they may not say that the exchange of equal values is induced by reason of some characteristic other than value. The assumption that equal values are demanded in exchange, is indulged by many who are not Socialists, but as applied by them it is not altogether fallacious because they allow that characteristics other than value attach to commodities, and these may induce exchange when values are equal. Socialists vitiate the little truth the assumption carries as used by others, when they exclude from the commodity they describe every characteristic except value. Moreover, it is necessary for them to exclude all others. For with all their ingenuity they cannot measure utility, rarity, oddity, beauty, style, or the many other characteristics that go to make up desirability,—they cannot gauge or estimate these by any of their various conceptions of labor, actual or abstract. Thus, the Socialists are hedged in on all sides. They are not able to imagine an intelligent exchange of equal values, or to allow that anything but values are exchanged. And thus, as an abstract theory, the Socialist principle of economics appears to be fatally defective at the very root.

2. *The practical folly.*

While the fallacious assumption that only equivalents are normally exchanged, is probably the most ruinous defect in the Socialist theory as a pure theory, there are other objections that seem quite as fatal to its application. Chief among these is the one found in applying that elusive if not meaningless term, social labor. There are ways of setting out pure nonsense in such fashion that the mind of man, not seriously reflecting, slips quite readily from one absurdity into another. Socialists are not the least experienced in this artful method of enunciation. They are aware that the average human intellect, like a moving body, follows the line of least resistance, and consequently they adopt, and, with an admirable display of ingenuity, adhere to, a plan which does not remove but seeks to avoid obvious difficulties, which does not discover but endeavors to keep hidden the obscure ones, and to this end they distinguish and differentiate and qualify with a zeal and a cleverness that might grace a better cause.

The term, social labor, serves this purpose of Socialists to a nicety. It overrides facts with the reckless abandon of a rebel archangel; assumes labor to exist where it does not, and denies its presence where it is perfectly obvious. The labor necessary to produce any commodity is just exactly the labor that produces it,—which differs with every different workman, every different stroke, and every different thought employed,—in every different minute of time and every different place in the world,—in quantity, quality, intensity, duration, skill. If two commodities ever were produced by precisely the same kind and quantity of labor, it was altogether due to

chance and is wholly impossible to determine. More nearly an infinite variant can hardly be imagined than the labor under different conditions necessary to produce a given commodity. No amount of word-juggling can do away with this variance or reduce it to a standard. Facts cannot be made to fit a theory; theory must conform to facts. It goes "trippingly on the tongue" for Socialists to talk about "ordinarily necessary labor," "labor on the average necessary," "normally necessary labor," "social labor," etc., and when these phrases are permitted to pass unchallenged, they make just the impression needed to wing the thought-free mind from one false principle to another. But when they are halted midway in their flight and examined, they prove to be as hollow as Dead Sea fruit, clashing with facts, supposing the non-existent to exist, and assuming the impossible to be accomplished. Not until human activity in all its phases gives place to mechanical devices, and the wants and wishes of society are realized by the touch of a button, can we intelligently speak of "ordinarily necessary labor," or the like.

3. *The social injustice.*

Another objection to the Socialist formula is its failure to allow for the different kinds of labor that persons perform. In the assumption that equivalents are demanded in the course of exchange, there is a logical absurdity; in the restriction of the term labor to what is termed social labor, there is a practical absurdity; in the failure to recognize the obvious differences that obtain in labor performed, there is a manifest injustice. That there is a difference not only in the labor-power but in the very labor of different persons, is a fact too obvious for dis-

pute. That this difference results in the production of different values, is equally beyond question. Nor can it be easily conceived how any just standardization of these differences is possible. The laws might be framed to attempt such a feat; the governmental powers can arbitrarily ignore even the most evident facts; but this would not root out the inborn sense of justice that ennobles the human race. Neither law nor logic can suspend the facts that bear on the question,—the labor of one man is often more productive than that of another, the product of one is often superior to that of another, the differences are independent of the cost of labor-power, but dependent on the will, the energy, the intelligence, the skill, talent or genius of the man. Theorists may willfully shut their eyes to these facts, like Mohammed seeking to uproot a mountain by the sound of his voice; but they, like the Moslem bluffer, must finally acknowledge the eternal truth that whatever is, is. The sad feature of their delusive folly is that after its exposure even, many blind fanatics will be ready to overturn the world for the sake of the very leaders who have deceived them.

“The lover may distrust the look that steals his soul away,
The alchemist may doubt the gold his crucibles fling out,
But faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast
To some dear falsehood, holds it to the last.”

If we could compare the amounts of the “necessities of life” consumed by a Mme. Curie, a Saint-Gaudens, an Edison, a Whitcomb Riley, with the amounts consumed by an equal number of persons engaged in cleaning a city thoroughfare, we would doubtless find that the consumption of the laborers is signally the greater. Ac-

cording to Socialist theory, this means that their labor-power is the more costly or more valuable and their labor-time should be the better paid. In illustrating this phase of their theory, Socialists very adroitly assume that it costs more to produce and maintain the labor-power of a skilled mechanic than of a plain workman, and more to produce that of an artist than of a mechanic, but this is only an instance of their thimble-rigging methods. Nothing could be wider of the truth. It is both a notable and a natural fact that muscle consumes more than mind of physical things. The cost of the labor-power spent in designing St. Peter's probably was no greater than the cost of that spent by Michel Angelo's servingman while putting away his master's summer garments. The labor-power of one person may cost little but produce much, while that of another may cost much but produce little. "Some men are born great, some achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them." It is not uncommon for a person with first-rate and costly opportunities to fail in the battle with life, while at the same time another person, who, like Topsy, "jes growed," overrides all obstacles in the way of splendid achievement. The former is really a hindrance to society, and the latter is a help to it, but the Socialist theory requires the greater reward for him who does the least, because, forsooth, his labor-power has cost more. Socialists will promptly disown a wrong so flagrant, but if the logic of things is not mistaken, this consequence results inevitably when their gauge of value is driven to its practical conclusion. Their effort to avoid this consequence only evinces the readiness common to pretenders to "go to the mountain" when necessary. It shows,

too, that whatever may be the convictions of their followers, the Socialist teachers are awake to the fact that, notwithstanding their energetic claims, their whole scheme of economics is illogical, impractical, unjust.

4. *The surplus value bogey.*

While the theory of surplus value falls with the fall of the theory of value, upon which it depends, still this theory is such a fruitful source of Socialist propaganda and enthusiasm that it claims some special attention. The surplus-value idea is subject to the same fatal trinity of objections that has been urged against its parent principle,—it does not square with logic or with facts or with justice. It is based, if not upon an impossible, at least upon an undeterminable hypothesis. Whether a workman produces more or less than he consumes during his life cannot possibly be determined. Hence, it can never be clear and certain that he has produced a surplus value. This is equally true of every class of workingmen. It is not even remotely possible to determine either the amount of production or the amount of consumption. No number of statistics can show to what extent railroads, highways, churches, schools, libraries, hospitals, etc., are used by a class and in part consumed. And of production, though it is conceivably possible to determine the amount a class produces of the simpler products that require no education, tools, or like previously acquired means for production, this is not true with respect to products whose production requires previously acquired means. Persons may not make use of these means, which they do not themselves produce, and then lay claim to the whole of the product that by use of them they are enabled to effect. Nor can the respective con-

tributions of the man and the means be apportioned. Socialists make an attempt at this. They say that a machine, for instance, contributes as much work to the product as the machine itself embodies.¹ But this is only substituting one difficulty for another. The machine also is a product, and those who produced it also use means not produced by them. Excluding *all* previously acquired means for production, it is difficult to imagine what could be produced by a person's own labor. The imaginative genius of Defoe was baffled by just such a difficulty, and he was compelled to supply his "Crusoe" with knife, gun, saw,—a generous tool chest, in fact, but above all, with wide experience and a surprising amount of practical information, and then Crusoe had great difficulty in producing more than a livelihood. Moreover, while thus feebly attacking the difficulty at one point with their example of the machine, Socialists pass over the fact that machinery is only one among innumerable factors that have been produced by previously expended labor and which co-operate with the instant labor in the process of production. Every achievement of the human race that has been made in the direction of increased productive capacity since its very beginning,—and Socialists teach that there is no achievement but was made in this direction,—must be considered when considering whether a workingman of to-day, by virtue of his own labor, produces more than he consumes.

Thus it seems a manifest error to assume that there is a surplus product created by any person or class. It

¹ "It makes no difference how useful a machine may be, if it costs but 50 days' labor it can add only that value to its product" (*Principles Scientific Socialism*, Vail, 39).

appears more probable that instead of producing more than they consume, most persons of all classes in the course of life consume more than they produce. When Socialists declaim about unpaid labor, exploitation, robbery, etc., they fail to take in *all* the elements that enter into production. When with a uniformity that, in view of the premises, argues less of deduction than of design, they set forth that the average workman is wrongfully deprived of four-fifths of his own product, they only elaborate an absurd fiction. But there is mischief in their propaganda despite its obvious futility. That a person is justly entitled to all *he* produces, is clear to everyone, and when one is persuaded that he is being systematically deprived of the greater part of his own product, and that the laws of his country afford no relief from such shameful wrongdoing, he is prepared to go any length to establish what he feels to be his just demands. The disposition thus aroused in the working classes that heed the Socialist outcry, is one of the chief forces back of the Socialist movement. It is a force that begins with a mere persuasion, but it grows into conviction, and thus furnishes the movement with an energy and a desperation that promise grave complications. If there is a class struggle anywhere in society, here is its origin. It is not the cause of Socialism, but the effect. It is engendered by Socialist propagandists who spare no pains to spread broadcast their inflammatory teachings. It is as broad as the field of their activity and as deadly as their effort at driving home its purpose is successful.

5. *The impossible class-struggle.*

There is about as much reason to suppose that there is an inherent and necessary conflict between capital and

labor, as to believe that the fabled dispute between the upper and nether millstones about which of them ground more of the miller's corn, is anything more real than a fable. When two or more factors are alike necessary to effect a result, it is idle to speculate which contributes most to the result. Natural resources, animal energy, and human intelligence are alike necessary for our civilization. The bringing of these factors together is a process of unification, not of conflict. Conflict means dissolution. Labor flows from animal energy and human intelligence combined; capital, from labor and natural resources combined. All that goes to make up our material civilization is the result of bringing together labor and capital. One or another of the primal factors may predominate in a particular instance,—intelligence in the labor of the artist, energy in that of the ditch-digger; in machine capital, labor; in landed capital, natural resources,—but the predominance shifts from time to time and from one instance to another, and always, the factors merge as it were in such a way as to be indistinguishable when embodied in the product they effect.

Since the combined factors mentioned produce civilization, in order to perpetuate itself civilization must make returns to them whereby they will be perpetuated, and, too, if civilization would advance, its return to these factors must improve them. This delicate adjustment of returns would not be possible on the hypothesis that there is an inherent conflict between labor and capital. Nothing would be more certain to halt the advance of civilization than a state of perpetual friction, not to say warfare, between these two chief factors in its production. In the long processes of material development in

the past, there are many instances of such a friction, and in every instance it has operated as a check on the progress of the human race. But wherever labor and capital have stood united, the march of both has been forward,—a consideration that should bring pause to the malcontents who would set them at loggerheads.

6. *The collectivist fatality.*

The norms of advancing civilization are not invariable, but two are necessary. They are: competition and justice. Competition is the law of achievement; justice, the law of reward. One insures advancement; the other, permanence. Both are essential to true progress. When justice is violated, revolution begins. Competition cannot be too keen, nor justice too exact, for the welfare of society, so long as the object of the one is merely greater achievement and that of the other only due reward. Injustice arises when competition is for reward greater than achievement. Just as promptly, competition begins to lag, when reward is not commensurate with achievement. To insure progress and permanence, the two must move along parallel lines, properly balanced, equally broad, equally enduring. The preservation of this balance should be the chief object of Government,—to prevent the stifling of competition and to secure the reward that is due. No better arrangement for this can be imagined than the system of private ownership, supplemented by laws whereby free competition is insured and undue advantage is prohibited and crowned by charity, whereby the unable and the unfit who fail in competition are cared for.² The surplus-value

² The indulgence of the reader is asked if some of the suggestions here made are repeated in the fourth chapter of Part

A STUDY

BEN

S
PUB

FREIBURG (BADEN)
GERMANY

A STUDY IN SOCIALISM

BY
BENEDICT ELDER
//

ST. LOUIS, MO., 1915
PUBLISHED BY B. HERDER

17 SOUTH BROADWAY

26 (BADEN)
GERMANY

| 68, GREAT RUSSELL STR.
LONDON, W. C.

H X 86
E 45

PD. 3.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 29. Sept. 1915.

*F. G. Holweck,
Censor Librorum.*

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 1. Oct. 1915.

*✠ Joannes J. Glennon,
Archiepiscopus,
Sti. Ludovici.*

*Copyright, 1915,
by
Joseph Gummersbach*

All rights reserved

Printed in U. S. A.

INTRODUCTION

I. SOCIALISM

What is Socialism?

"I know if you do not ask me," said St. Augustine, when asked: What is Time? Most of us feel that we know what Socialism is until we begin to define it. It may be called a modern social phenomenon. It springs from modern industrial conditions as they are combined with the more modern phases of sentiment and thought. A more particular definition would only invite criticism and dispute. Socialists themselves are not agreed on a definition. One says it is a religious movement,¹ another a moral movement,² another, a humanitarian movement.³ In the *Communist Manifesto* it is termed a "proletarian movement," in the Chicago platform, a "purely economic movement," in the Gotha and Erfurt Programs and other official utterances in Europe and America, a revolutionary movement, a political movement, a working-class movement, a movement for the abolition of classes, for better working conditions, for social justice, for the emancipation of labor, etc., etc.

Then again, Socialism is defined to be not a movement but a principle,⁴ and again not merely a principle but a science.⁵ Frederick Engels says that it is a "complete

¹ *Socialism and Primitive Christianity*, Brown, 4.

² Geo. D. Herron, *Metropolitan*, August, 1913.

³ *The Passing of Capitalism*, Ladoff, 53.

⁴ *The Substance of Socialism*, Spargo, 84.

⁵ Ladoff, *op. cit.*, 39.

system of philosophy, mental, moral, natural and historical.”⁶ Another says it is a “complete system of thought with regard to human society and social progress.”⁷ Untermann says briefly that it is a “general key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe.”⁸ It is doubtless in contemplation of this illimitable character of Socialism that Ladoff exclaims: “To be a true Socialist is the highest distinction a man can attain on earth.”

In the book, *What Is Socialism*, written by R. G. Kauffman, one rightly expects to find a fairly adequate definition. But after devoting some fifteen thousand words to the task of showing that Socialism is a kind of political economy, calculated especially to benefit the working class, the writer opens his third chapter by saying: “I have said that Socialism, though expressing itself politically, is an economic force. Do not suppose, however, that the dyed-in-the-wool Socialist stops there. He has not been content until he has sought to discover a reason for his being, he has reconstructed his entire cosmos and the net consequence is a philosophy that embraces the whole body of art and morality,—embraces, indeed, all history and all life.” “It may be convenient for Socialists,” says E. Belfort Bax, “with a view to election expediency, to seek to confine the definition of Socialism to the economic issue. But the attempt to limit the term Socialism within the four walls of an economic definition is in the long run futile.”⁹

⁶ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 10.

⁷ *Industrial Socialism*, Haywood and Bohn, 55.

⁸ *Science and Revolution*, 127.

⁹ *Essays in Socialism*, quoted by Kauffman, *op. cit.*, 64. Cf. also, Ladoff, *op. cit.*, 39; *The Socialist Movement*, Vail, 2.

But, whether it is the result of misapprehension, or of tactical design, there is in Socialist propaganda a great number of definitions that plainly show an effort to confine the term Socialism "within the four walls of an economic." Deville says: "Socialism is the theoretical expression of the contemporaneous phase of the *economic* evolution of humanity."¹⁰ Another Socialist says: "Socialism is not a consequence of dreams any more than a certain type of plant. It is a product of economic evolution, a child of economic necessity."¹¹ "Socialism," says another, "is naught but Darwinism *economized*, made definite, applied to the economic conditions of human society."¹² Edward Bernstein defines Socialism as "the movement toward, or the actual existence of, the co-operative organization of society."¹³ Gaylord Wiltshire says, "It is the governmental ownership and management of capital and the co-operative distribution of the product of the workers."¹⁴ Morris Hillquit says it is "summed up" in the program that "requires the public or collective ownership and operation of the principal instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth," and he adds: "Whoever accepts this program is a Socialist, whoever does not, is not." Finally, there is one definition that may be found generally set out in Socialist propaganda: "Socialism is the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange."

¹⁰ *Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism*, 3.

¹¹ *Industrial Problems*, Richardson, 225.

¹² Preface to *Socialism and Positive Science*, MacDonald.

¹³ Quoted by Cathrein, *Socialism*, Eng. trans., 19.

¹⁴ *Why a Woman Should be a Socialist*, 17.

An English critic of Socialism says: "Socialists are agreed on one proposition and only one. They are all united in asserting that the 'socialization of the means of production, distribution and exchange' would provide a universal panacea for the ills of society."¹⁵ But they are not agreed on the meaning of this definition; they differ as to what socialization is and they differ as to the means that are to be socialized. "Their unity," says De Tunzleman, "resembles the unity existing among quacks who advertise pills that cure all ills. They are agreed that pills will cure all ills, but each maintains that they must be his own pills."

We have said that Socialism is a modern social phenomenon; but what are its principles? what is its history? and what are its aims? The three divisions of this book are devoted to answering these questions. The "Principles" of Socialism are considered first. They are set out in the language of Socialists, taken first hand from the writings of acclaimed leaders and teachers of Socialism in this and other countries.¹⁶ They are subjected to the light of reason and of truth: of reason admitting first principles; of truth in its own objectivity. There is such truth: science, religion, morals is rooted in such truth; human life in all its bearings comes in contact with it constantly, and only by its conscious or unconscious recognition is man more than an automaton. If it seems a reflection upon the intelligence of almost every one to call attention to truths that are axiomatic, there is a rea-

¹⁵ *The Superstition Called Socialism*, De Tunzleman, 84.

¹⁶ Wherever quotations appear without a reference, they will be found quoted elsewhere in this study with proper references.

son: Socialist fundamentals contradict them; and Socialism is accepted by many sincere people. So if this study is to serve any purpose as an antidote for Socialist teaching, it must bring before the mind those first truths whose neglect caused that teaching to be accepted. In the book, *Outcome of Philosophy*, by J. Dietzgen, it is said: "The universe is an organism and the infinite cause and effect of everything, including itself."¹⁷ Marx used to refer to Dietzgen as "our philosopher." Of course, to think of anything as being the cause of itself, or the effect of itself, or both the cause and the effect of anything, is to think in contradictory terms. In a paper communicated to the Socialist International Congress of 1865, Marx wrote: "We begin by saying that the value of labor determines the value of commodities and we wind up by saying that the value of commodities determines the value of labor. Here we come to a standstill. Of course, to a standstill if we try to reason logically." He said again, that his "explanation of the source of profits is a paradox and contrary to everyday observation and experience." Yet, he did not hesitate, nor do his followers hesitate, to claim that his teachings are the last word in economic science, or in all science for that matter. These examples of the way in which Socialists disregard the fundamental laws of right thinking seem sufficient warrant for a study of Socialism to call attention to truths the acceptance of which is indispensable to the integrity of every teaching.

¹⁷ Cf. *Revolution a Science*, Untermann, 151, where it is said that Dietzgen "demonstrated" the absurd statement quoted and by that means "perfected his materialistic monism."

II. SOCIALISTS

Having shown by a first-hand study of its "Principles" what Socialism stands for, we next proceed to show what Socialists as a class have done. We present a panoramic view of the "History of Socialism," which includes a brief sketch of the development of the Idea, the Sentiment, and the Movement. The facts detailed are necessarily meagre and the outline must be incomplete in many respects. The Idea drawn out is not common to all Socialists without exception, and, hence, will draw the fire of some of them. This is true with respect to the Sentiment, also. And likewise as to the Movement. There are as many kinds of Socialists as there are many kinds of Socialism. There is the "cross-barred" Socialist, who is either in prison for committing a crime or is trying to break in by committing one; there is Ladoff's "Socialist-pure-and-simple," who claims he has nothing to do with religion or morals or the family; there is Kauffman's "dyed-in-the-wool" Socialist, who reconstructs his entire cosmos and all history and all life in the terms of Socialism. M. Hillquit sets out a program that requires public ownership of the means for producing wealth and says: "Whoever accepts this program is a Socialist; whoever does not, is not." The Socialist Party of the United States sets out another program, which requires "a new world out of the old," where everything will be changed, "the boots on people's feet, the clothing they wear, the houses they inhabit, the work they do, the education they get, their places, their honors and all their possessions . . . will have to undergo as complete a change as a caterpillar does when it becomes a

moth," and it says: "Unless you demand all this, unless you are prepared to fight for all this, you are not really a Socialist."¹

There is no unfailing test of Socialist adherence. Many believe in government ownership of certain industries, and some say they are Socialists, but the Socialist platform adopted at Rochester anxiously "warned the people against all public-ownership movements as an attempt of the capitalist class to secure governmental control of public utilities for the purpose of obtaining greater security in the exploitation of other industries." Many believe that modern industrial conditions call for shorter hours, higher wages, and better working conditions for laborers, and some say these are Socialists; but these reforms were agitated long before Socialism was known. The Craft Guilds of the Middle Ages were both zealous and efficient in promoting the welfare of the working classes. And long before the existence of the guilds there were unions active in the interests of the workers.² After the guilds had broken up, better hours, wages and working conditions continued to be agitated, and it is this agitation, expanded and grown, and not Socialism, that has brought about the labor legislation existing in various countries. Socialists, as a class, have contributed nothing to this legislation. In fact, where they have been in a position to take part in

¹ *Socialist Campaign Book*, 1908, compiled under the direction of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party (U. S.), 26, 27.

² Cf. M. Davidson's *Annals of Toil*, 6, where he mentions the discovery in the ruins of Pompeii of a placard announcing the nomination for public office of a member of a union.

the matter, they have opposed all measures looking to reform, because "Socialism is not a reform, but a revolution"; "it is not a remedy for the existing ills of society but a program for a new society." It is Socialist teaching that "no wage can ever be a just reward for a day's work,"³ that a general increase of wages is a detriment instead of a benefit to wage earners because "the power of the capitalist class over labor is increased, the social position of the laborer is deteriorated"; therefore, "the cry for a fair wage is an insane wish never to be fulfilled." And it is a Socialist tactic in most countries, though being only a tactic it does not obtain in all alike, that all reforms looking toward the betterment of the working man are to be voted down on the theory that they merely make the working classes more contented and thereby postpone the day when they will join in the Great Revolution. It is true, in the platforms of the Socialist parties there appear demands for certain reforms that would benefit the workers, but in all of those platforms, immediately following these demands, is the announcement: "Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism, are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government that they may lay hold of the entire system of industry and thus come into their rightful inheritance."

Some Socialists claim that the workers are entitled to the entire product of labor. Indeed, an official declaration of American Socialists is that they "propose to place the workers in possession of all they produce." Other Socialists say that before the workers are paid

³ *Industrial Problems*, Richardson, 31.

anything, there must be deducted "a portion to take the place of taxes, a portion to replace the labor consumed, one to extend the scale of production, one to insure against disasters, one to support the incapables, one for administration, one for sanitation, one for education, etc." ⁴ Then there are State Socialists, like Wells, Hillquit, and Spargo, who imagine there will be government and law and all the paraphernalia of State when Socialism is ushered in; and there are others, like Blatchford, who says: "No man who understands liberty, equality, fraternity, could live under State Socialism. It would be hell." There are "Christian" Socialists, who teach that Christ was the first Socialist; and there are others, who say He was a vagabond. And there are "Parlor" Socialists and "Revisionists" and "Opportunists" and "Impossibilists," and so forth.

This book, in the main, treats of Scientific Socialists, of their teaching, their history and their proposals. From their teaching we learn what Socialism is; from their history, what Socialists have done; and their teaching and their history combine to throw a true light upon what they propose to do. Their history must be considered in the light of human nature, which does not change. Socialists are used to regard human nature as changeable. "Is it possible to change human nature?" asks Ladoff, who recognizes that, unless it is changed, "history will repeat itself," and Socialists in the future, as they have in the past, will do nothing but stir up discontent and produce nothing but lawlessness and crime; and Ladoff answers himself: "This objection is by no means new. The man-eater certainly [?] did object in

⁴ *Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism*, Deville, 33.

the same way to the reformers who suggested that enslaving prisoners would be preferable to eating them;” and he adds the statement that he will not further answer the question “because it would be too tedious.”⁵

But if human nature were not unchangeable, Socialism would surely effect a noticeable change in it. Are Socialists less human than are others? Have they no selfishness, envy, greed, inordinate ambition? Do harmony, peace, and good will everywhere rule among them? Are they distinguished for their works of charity, their deeds of mercy or justice, their honesty and good moral character? Do they excel in loyalty, love for law, respect for authority, in purity, integrity, and nobility of life and conduct? It is written: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” What have the Socialists done? How many hospitals have they built? how many schools endowed? how many orphans’ homes established? how many asylums for the afflicted? If we were treating of an ordinary political organization, such questions would be captious rather than critical. But when it is claimed that Socialism is a complete system of philosophy in its every phase,—“broad as humanity and deep as the mystery of life,”—“a key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe,”—“the only proposition for social order ever presented to the world,”—when it is claimed that this complete system of thought which embraces the entire cosmos and all history and all life, “is taught in more than sixty languages and accepted by more than thirty million persons,”—it is pertinent to ask what have Socialists as a class done during the more than sixty years since their movement took definite form?

⁵ *Passing of Capitalism*, 6.

III. SOCIALISDOM

In a series of debative letters exchanged some years ago between Robt. Rives La Monte, "Scientific Socialist," and H. L. Mencken, "Nietzschean Individualist," which have since been published under the title *Men vs. The Man*, La Monte criticises his opponent for using the expression "Under Socialism" in referring to a supposed society where Socialism is established. "Socialism is not an umbrella or an awning," says La Monte. This is mentioned by way of accounting for the use in this work of a word of our own making,—*Socialisdom*, which is used in the sense of the society wherein Socialism must cease to be mere theory and be put into actual practice.

If the principles of Socialism must be made to harmonize with reason and truth, and its history must be judged in the light of human nature, with equal necessity its aims must be subjected to the test of practicability. It is a common objection that Socialism is impossible. This applies in particular to its basic proposals. They are not impossible in the absolute sense of the term, perhaps, but they are practically impossible. Instead of using the word impossible in this connection, the more precise critic says impracticable. To this the Socialists retort that the same thing was said about nearly all modern improvements, that it is the stock-in-trade objection of the reactionary and was urged against popular government, universal education, steam and electric appliances, transcontinental railroads, irrigation and reclamation projects in the great West, and so forth, and that it is entitled to no more weight when urged against Socialism

than it was when urged against these and other ventures that are now achievements. But there is a difference. It is the Socialist proposals themselves, and not the means for applying them, that are impracticable. They are contrary to reason, to truth, to human experience. They are contrary to nature and the laws of nature. They are contrary to each other. Hence, they are not merely impractical, they are impracticable. It is not that they would be difficult, tedious, trying, expensive, tyrannical, unjust, in their operation;—they cannot be put into operation. Such is the meaning of those who are careful to say only that Socialism is impracticable, and such is the meaning generally intended in this study when it is said to be impossible. The latter term is here employed because in its popular acceptation the term impracticable does not convey the meaning intended, and to the popular mind, which is not exactly critical, that meaning can be conveyed only by use of the term impossible.

It should be borne in mind, however, that we are treating of only the essential aims of Socialism, such as the “abolition of the State, the atrophy of religion, the metamorphosis of the family, the destruction of property,” and the erection upon the ruin thus made of a society where “idleness or selfishness or sin will be unknown,” where “all will have plenty and be content and the sweet spirit of Comradeship will blossom forth like the fabled rose of unchanging beauty.” With the demands Socialists set out in their platform “as measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of its ultimate aim,” such as ownership of public utilities, conservation of natural resources, industrial in-

surance, old-age pensions, equal suffrage, initiative, referendum and recall, this study is not concerned. They are no part of Scientific Socialism. Not only are they extraneous to Socialism, they are inconsistent with it, and while in civilization they are for the most part practicable and even practical, not to say judicious, they would not be possible in Socialisdom. This fact must not be overlooked. Those who take up Socialism must abandon Civilization. Those who desire the advent of Socialisdom must be willing to give up Civilization. There is no way to combine the two. There is no looking back for the Scientific Socialist, who is the only Socialist worthy of the name.

Ibsen wrote a play called *The Doll's House*. In it he describes Nora as growing tired of her husband and his home and his people, and as leaving them "without taking anything, and without sending back." She broke completely with the old life and thenceforth "took nothing from strangers," as all in the old life were considered to be. This is Ibsen's strong point. Nora was happy because her life was new out and out. In *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, La Monte seizes on Nora's act to illustrate his estimate of a Socialist, who, like Nora, if he would be content, can take nothing, not even jewels from strangers, but must break entirely with civilization and center all his hopes, all his aspirations, all his ideals in Socialism. The casual reader of Socialist literature is apt to miss this point because all Socialists are not so frank as La Monte, who does not hesitate to head a chapter of his book "The Nihilism of Socialism," nor to write up to the mark suggested. One cannot be too wary of Socialist tactics. Whether dealing with their

principles, their history or their aims, one will find on examination and comparison that the Socialists are past-masters in the art of thimble-rigging. The unvarying hue of their dark fortunes (except of their leaders who have capitalized the delusions of their "comrades" to become rich) has schooled them in the ways of cleverness and cunning, and there is scarcely any class of people upon which their fine play of words and of sentiment does not have some effect. Their writings are both varied and voluminous, and they make a show of learning that is wholly deceptive. There are few known subjects of which they do not treat, and there is not one they treat that they do not assume to say the last word about. Where scientists have doubts, the Socialists are certain; where statesmen hesitate, they go ahead; where angels fear to tread, they rush in. Their audacity is almost beyond belief. They claim to be able to solve "all the riddles of the universe" by their philosophy, and when their society comes, "there will be nothing that the human heart can long for that it will not get, and nothing that the human mind can conceive that it will not understand."

Why do people believe these extravagant claims? They do not believe them. They are captured by Socialist tactics. Spargo writes his *Bitter Cry of the Children*, and they seem to hear the piteous wail; London publishes his *Iron Heel*, and they seem to feel the crushing weight; Hunter portrays the life of misery in *Poverty*, and this picture stirs their deepest emotions. Millions of copies of these writings are circulated each year, and for the most part are read by people who do not know "how the other half of the world lives" and

who respond with feeling, or by others who do not care what comes if they can only "get even" with the hated capitalist; they respond with feeling too, but of a different kind; their aim is to do anything that will injure the man above them; Socialism promises "the deep damnation of his taking off," and therefore, they are Socialists. But the feeling of the others, whose hearts are touched by the cry of suffering, though different, is wrought up by the same tactic; they think in the lurid light of what they read and their aim to do something for suffering humanity becomes desperate and they grow indifferent to consequences, imagining that the worst cannot be worse than what is pictured to them. They do not consider that for centuries, the best minds and the purest hearts have been devoted to bettering the conditions they deplore, and have been fairly successful, and but for visionary ideas of the future or pessimistic ideas of the present, they would be more successful; they do not consider that the poor are always with us, and that it is the poor in spirit, the humble, the clean of heart, who "will see God." They hear this cry of suffering sounded by Socialists, coming from the lips of little children, from the anguished hearts of mothers, from the echo of sweat-drops as they fall from the brows of broken men upon their luckless labor; they hear it on the winds of fortune, as it mingles with the sounds of riches, revelry, and debauching, and they are swept off the rock of understanding by the wave of sympathy that surges over them. Not reflecting that this life is only a preparation for happiness, and if it could be itself happiness there would be no need of a life to come, not distinguishing between heaven and earth, their souls are

stirred, and they respond with spirit to the cry of the Socialists: "There is no justice! Our civilization is perverted! Sweep away! Destroy! Turn back the wheels of Time and begin over!" This is the spirit that makes for Socialism,—discontent, noble or ignoble; recklessness; desperation! This is why it is of the utmost importance to consider in detail what Socialism will be and how it would meet the practical problems of a civilized and progressing society.

For there is no doubt that society is progressing. It is progressing among all classes, though perhaps not among some so much as they deserve. And if it cannot be demonstrated that it will progress more rapidly in Socialism, none but the malcontents of society will cry out for the change. We speak of progress chiefly in the sense that it is an expansion and growth of the spirit of love—for God and fellowman. In this dual spirit we write. Who does not read in a like spirit might as well stop, for to leave God or humanity out of the equation of the universe is to unseat reason from its throne and make of all thought, all desire and all effort, things but of folly and despair.

PREFACE

This book is the first of a contemplated series which will treat of modern social evils and their correction. That injustice and wrong largely characterize present day industrial conditions is too plain to be denied, too serious to be ignored.

Socialism is to-day the most conspicuous proposal looking to a betterment of these conditions, and its teachings and their bearing, therefore, are properly of first consideration in this series. The attitude of the writer toward Socialism is frankly hostile,—so much the reader is entitled now to know,—but it may not be doubted that the criticism and protest of Socialist propaganda have done much to bring about certain wholesome reforms begun in the last quarter-century.

The numbers of the series which are to follow will deal more directly with the principal social ills, pointing out the chief causes as well as the occasions for their existence and suggesting possible means of getting rid of them. Each number, like this one, will be arranged in chapters and sections with the view of being easily adapted to the uses of a text book. A list of authorities is appended for the convenience of those who would make a more thorough study of the subject, and a full index follows for ready reference.

Quite a number of persons have assisted me in the

PREFACE

preparation of this work, and though their modesty is such that I may not name them this acknowledgement cannot be unwelcome when it is so cheerfully and gratefully made.

BENEDICT ELDER.

Louisville, Kentucky
October 15, 1915.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

	PAGE
I Socialism	iii
II Socialists	viii
III Socialisdom	xiii

FIRST PART

(By sections)

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE ECONOMIC PRINCIPLE

I Value	3
II Surplus Value	8
III The Class Struggle	10
IV Ownership	13
V Objections:	15
1. The root fallacy	15
2. The practical folly	17
3. The social injustice	18
4. The surplus value bogey	21
5. The impossible class struggle	23
6. The collectivist fatality	25

CHAPTER TWO

THE PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLE

I Method	27
II Content	30

CONTENTS

	PAGE
III Theory of the Universe	33
IV "Economic Determinism"	40
V Summary and Analysis	46

CHAPTER THREE

THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE

I Godlessness	49
II Humanitarianism	52
III Hostile Attitude	54
IV Malicious Attitude	57
V Religion and Socialism Contrasted	60
1. Natural Religion	61
2. Revealed Religion	62
3. Christianity	63

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MORAL PRINCIPLE

I Morals Distinguished from Ethics	67
II Free Will a Condition of Morality	68
III End of Man the Basis of Morality	70
IV Socialist Conception of Morality	73
V The Moral Law of Socialism	81

CHAPTER FIVE

THE POLITICAL PRINCIPLE

I Civil Authority	87
II The State	91
III Civil Law	100

CHAPTER SIX

THE SOCIAL PRINCIPLE

I Sociality	114
-----------------------	-----

CONTENTS

	PAGE
II Social Classes	116
III Class-consciousness	119

SECOND PART THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE IDEA

I Platonic	135
II Utopian	142
III "Scientific"	151
IV Practical	159

CHAPTER TWO

THE SENTIMENT	163
-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER THREE

THE MOVEMENT

I Formative Period	178
II The "International"	188
III National Parties	193
1. Germany	193
2. England	198
3. United States	203

THIRD PART THE AIMS OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

AS A THOUGHT MOVEMENT

I In Philosophy	219
II In Religion	223
III In Morals	226

CONTENTS

CHAPTER TWO

	PAGE
As A POLITICAL MOVEMENT	
I Revolution	229
1. A Criticism	233
II Reconstruction	236
1. As to what the State must acquire ownership in	238
2. As to how acquisition by the State is effected .	246
(a) A Comment	251

CHAPTER THREE

As AN ECONOMIC MOVEMENT	
I The Operation of Industry	254
1. As to the Division of Labor	256
2. As to the Direction of Labor	263
II The Distribution of Goods	270
1. As to the Needs of Society	271
2. "To Each According to His Needs"	274
3. "From Each According to His Ability"	275
(a) A Suggestion	277

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

STATEMENT	
I Value	291
II Surplus Value	292
III The Class Struggle	292
IV The System	292
V The Remedy	293
REFUTATION	294
AUTHORITIES	301
INDEX	319

FIRST PART
THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

A STUDY IN SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE ECONOMIC PRINCIPLE

I. VALUE

The Socialist principle of economics lies at the root of Socialist philosophy. This principle is variously defined and described, and variously illustrated by Socialists; but with due consideration for diversity of expression and of detail, it is fairly summed up in the Marxian formula: Labor is the source of all value.¹

As employed in this formula, the term value has a meaning quite distinct from that commonly accepted. It here signifies, not utility or desirability, but merely an exchange characteristic. It does not belong to things in general, but only to commodities. The distinction made by Socialists between products and commodities more fully elucidates their use of the term value. A commodity is an article produced for purposes of ex-

¹ Though it has come to be identified with the teachings of Karl Marx, the principle set out in the formula was clearly held by Ricardo. It perhaps was first suggested by Smith (*Wealth of Nations*, 37), but only as obtaining in the very earliest stages of civilization.

change. An article produced for consumption without exchange is simply a product. Not being designed for use, but for exchange, a commodity has no use characteristic. Likewise, not being designed for exchange, a product has no exchange characteristic. Value is an exchange characteristic. It is that characteristic in an article offered for exchange by which the article to be received in exchange is measured.²

With this understanding of the restricted sense in which the term value is used, we can follow the Socialist argument, which perhaps is best presented by an illustration. Suppose that the owner of a wheat surplus, which on account of its being a surplus, is meant for exchange, and is, therefore, a commodity, wishes to receive furniture, clothes, implements, live stock, for each of which commodities he offers a certain quantity of wheat. In each case he demands an equivalent for what he offers. The diversity of these commodities is such that a common measure or comparison of the things themselves is not possible. Some characteristic must be found that is alike embodied in all of them, so that by comparing the quantity of this characteristic embodied in one commodity with a more or less quantity embodied in another, their relative values may be determined. This common characteristic is labor. Nothing but labor is alike necessary to all commodities. Hence, labor is the only common denominator as it were, in the com-

² Marx (*Capital*, 2-5), distinguishes between "use-value" and "exchange-value." By the first term, he means simply utility; by the second, value in the sense of the text: "Exchange-value is the only form in which VALUE can manifest itself or be expressed."

modities of the world, and it is consequently the source and the determinant of all value.³

As used in the Marxian formula, also, the term labor has a distinctive meaning. Among the earlier Socialists there appears a tendency to restrict the meaning of this term to manual labor; but the Socialists of the present time, following the later utterances of Marx, enlarge its meaning to include the various human functions ordinarily exercised in the production of commodities. The extension of the scope of this term has obviated many serious difficulties that Socialist apologists formerly encountered. Other difficulties remain, however, and to meet these, Socialists reverse the process and restrict the meaning of the term labor to what they call "social labor." The necessity for this appears from the fact that not infrequently commodities of the same kind and of equal quantity embody different amounts of labor. Take two tons of coal, one of which was mined hundreds of feet under-ground and the other gathered from an out-crop. It cannot in truth be said that the former, which embodies much more labor than the latter, is of a much greater value. Now if both tons, though embodying vastly different amounts of labor, are of equal value, this fact vitiates the Socialist formula. To meet this difficulty, Socialists make use of the term, social labor, and distinguish it from waste labor and "gratuitous service."

Social labor is defined as the sum of human effort that under average social conditions is necessary to produce a given commodity. Where, by reason of igno-

³ The illustration is adapted from Chas. H. Vail's *Principles of Scientific Socialism*.

rance, lack of skill, aversion to modern methods, or the like, one expends more labor in the production of a commodity than is ordinarily necessary, it is reckoned a waste of labor,—as where one would dig into the earth for coal when there was an abundance on the surface. On the other hand, where a commodity is produced with less labor than is ordinarily necessary, it is deemed an instance of gratuitous service,—as where one would find an out-cropping when coal was generally being mined from under-ground. Neither waste labor nor gratuitous service, but only social labor, is reckoned in the value of a commodity. Hence, the two tons of coal instanced, though embodying different quantities of actual labor, are of equal value because they represent equal quantities of social labor.⁴

Socialists find yet another distinction to be necessary to make their theory plausible. Neither the quality nor the intensity, but only the duration of labor can be measured. Therefore, quality and intensity must be eliminated from the characteristics of labor as it goes to make up value. To do this without seeming to vitiate their principle, Socialists differentiate labor and labor-power. Labor is ordinarily regarded as a commodity that is bought and sold as other commodities; but it is obvious, say the Socialists, that it is not labor itself that is bought and sold on the markets, for before it is expended it does not exist and after it is expended it is crystallized in the commodity produced, which ordinarily belongs to the capitalist instead of the laborer, therefore, it is proper to consider labor-power and not labor as the

⁴ Cf. *Value, Price and Profit*, Marx, 56 et seq.

commodity.⁵ Being a commodity, labor-power has a value, which like the value of all other commodities, is determined by the labor necessary to its production, that is to say, by the labor embodied in the commodities consumed in the production of the labor-power.⁶ One kind of labor-power differs in value from another kind, not because it is a different kind, either in quality or intensity, but only because it required different amounts of what may be broadly termed "the necessities of life" to produce them.⁷ If it requires \$1000 worth of commodities to develop a plain workman, \$3000 for a mechanic and \$10,000 for an artist, the labor-power of the mechanic would be three times that of the workman in value and that of the artist ten times that of the workman. The workman need only perform three units of labor-time to equal one of the mechanic and ten to equal one of the artist. Thus, labor is freed from all such characteristics as quality and intensity and reduced to a common product, measurable in time units of hours, days or weeks.⁸

⁵ Cf. Deville's *Socialism, Internationalism and Revolution*, 15; also, Marx's *Value, Price and Profit*, 73.

⁶ "Thus," says Marx (*op. cit.*), "we begin by saying that the value of labor determines the value of commodities and we conclude by saying that the value of commodities determines the value of labor."

⁷ "Skilled labor," says Marx (*Capital*, 7), "counts only as simple labor multiplied, a given quantity of skilled being equal to a greater quantity of unskilled labor. For simplicity's sake we account every kind of labor simple labor."

⁸ Vail says (*op. cit.*, 43): "One hour's work of the artist, say, represents 5 units, and that of the hod-carrier, one. Thus all concrete labor can be reduced to units of abstract labor measurable in time units of hours, days or weeks. The same is true of

Socialists seem to be very sure that their ingenuity has thus met every objection to be urged against their theory of value, and that with the distinctions noted thoroughly understood, this theory is the only correct basis upon which to build a scientific scheme of political economy. Before undertaking to point out other objections that seem to us valid, it may be well first to note the bearings of this theory on other Socialist theories of economics.

II. SURPLUS-VALUE

It is said that an understanding of the theory of Surplus-Value is the beginning of Socialist knowledge.¹ Without a doubt, this theory is of the most radical importance to Socialism. It is the working theory of the Socialist movement. Although somewhat tedious to define, with the aid of practical illustrations it can be grasped quite readily.

Surplus-value is the product of surplus labor. Surplus labor is the labor exerted over and above that which is necessary to restore the labor-power exhausted. If a man produces enough of "the necessities of life" to last professional labor. Quality is thus reduced to quantity." Cf. also, *Socialism from Genesis to Revelation*, Sprague, 61. It is after fully developing this idea that Vail declares (91) that "Under Socialism, vouchers for labor would take the place of money. For every day's labor a certificate would be issued against the wealth created, which would exchange for any commodity containing that amount of labor-time."

¹ Cf. *Industrial Socialism*, 56. Perhaps the plainest statement of this theory to be found in Socialist literature appears in Marx's *Value, Price and Profit*, 75, sqq. Cf. also, *Capital*, 128, sqq. Marx no doubt derived the idea of Surplus-Value from the English writers, Godwin, Hall, and Thompson, but he does not appear to have given them the credit.

him one day by working only two hours, then the value of his labor-power for a day is equivalent to two hours of work. For that man two hours of work each day is "necessary labor;" all the work he does over that is surplus labor, which produces surplus value.

Since it is a commodity, labor-power has a value, and this value is determined by the labor worked up in the "necessities" consumed in developing the labor-power. But, though its *value* is thus definitely limited, the *use* of the labor-power is limited only by the strength, skill, and energy of the laborer. Having produced the value of his labor-power he may continue to work until his ability is exhausted, but in such a case, all that he produces during the over-time is surplus value. To one not practiced in the vagaries of Socialistic expression, this will appear more simple by considering that the value of labor-power is equivalent to cost. Therefore, when the cost has been replaced by the use of the labor-power for a given time, whatever further use is made of it results in profit. Surplus value, therefore, is equivalent to profit.²

² "Out of it," says a Socialist writer (N. A. Richardson, *Industrial Problems*, 21), "are paid all dividends, interest, rents, and profits. It supports tens of thousands wholesale and retail establishments. It builds the railways, business blocks, factories, highways and mansions of the nation. It furnishes the blood and sinew of an industrial tyranny." "It is unpaid labor," says another (Geo. D. Herron, *Revolution to Revolution*, 13), "that towers in the steeples of our churches, that sits in our legislatures, that builds palaces in our avenues, that blossoms in our fashions, that drones in our academies, that produces our novels and our poetry and sings in Kipling's brute heroics. Our civilization and all the civilizations that have been, are but institutional-

Socialist propagandists usually define surplus value as *unpaid* labor. When an employer hires labor-power, he pays for its *value*, that is, sufficient to maintain it. But by paying for its value for one day, he acquires the right to *use* it, not only for such time as is necessary to reproduce its value, but for the entire day. If it reproduces its value in two hours, and the employer uses it for ten hours, he gets eight hours of labor for which he does not pay. This is what Socialists mean when they say that the workingman is "robbed" by his employer of about 80% of his wages.³ The employer is the "capitalist" of society. He hires labor-power at its value, but extracts from it all the use of which it is capable, and thus realizes out of the mere incident of relation between employer and employe an indefensible profit by means of which he constantly and systematically increases the advantage of his position. From this idea, another Socialist theory is begotten.

III. THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Socialists teach that society is divided into two great classes, the class that produces and the class that consumes surplus value, the working class and the capitalist class. The interests, the aims, and the hopes of these
ized unpaid labor, conventionalized robbery of the common labor of mankind."

³ Debs says (*Life, Writings and Speeches*, 428): "The worker receives only about 17% of the product of his labor and is robbed of 83%." Another Socialist authority (*National Office Bulletin*, No. 14) puts it exactly at 87.52%. These figures are based on the total output of the several industries, and do not allow for cost of maintenance, taxes, insurance, rents, interest, and the like, to say nothing of dividends and profits.

two classes are diametrically opposed, and no sort of reform measures can do away with this conflicting character. The working class is entitled to all it produces: "If the workingman is not entitled to all he produces, who is?" asks Debs in his catch-penny way of speaking. Of course, the realization of this idea means the utter destruction of the capitalist class, which the Socialist platform declares has "no right to be." Here, we have a deadly conflict, on one side or the other of which is ranged every member of society. This class-conflict has been going on ever since, in the course of his advancement, man's productive capacity began to outrun the cost of his maintenance. It will continue until the capitalist class is destroyed. Its intensity may be diminished, as in the past it has been, by revolution or reform; it may at times seem almost to pass away, owing to changes in the mode of production or in the capitalist base of exploitation; but withal, the conflict between workingmen and capitalists is an inherent conflict that can cease only when one or the other class has been removed from society. During the centuries past, the struggle on the part of the working class has been more instinctive than intelligent, and for this reason, notwithstanding its greater numbers, it has been unable to throw off the oppression of the capitalists. Indeed, the great numbers of the workers, each of which is a unit producing surplus value for the benefit of the capitalist class, has only served to make the oppression more grievous. But, thanks to Socialism, the working class is rapidly becoming more intelligent, and it is only a matter of time when all of its members will attain to "class-consciousness," when, instead of strengthening the position of the capi-

talists, as they now unwittingly do, they will overthrow and destroy them.¹

Such is the Socialist Class-struggle theory, which, in connection with the theory of surplus value, is diligently taught by all Socialist propagandists. Indeed, it may in truth be said that the immediate aim of all Socialist endeavor is to instill into the minds of certain classes of workingmen the belief that they are being systematically robbed by the capitalists and the conviction that they are powerful enough to put an end to this system, by force if necessary. The ultimate aim is the extinction of capitalists and capitalism, and whatever promises in the remotest degree to further this purpose is acceptable to Socialists. But the crowning device of their scheme to root out capitalism from civilization and lift the workingman from his low estate, is that of public or collective ownership of the means for production, distribution, and exchange. The Socialist principle of economics begins with the theory of value; it ends with the theory of public or collective ownership.²

¹ Cf. Communist Manifesto (1848), Gotha (1875) and Erfurt (1891) Programs and the platforms of the Socialist Party of the United States, 1904, 1908, 1912. Nearly all Socialist propaganda sets out the Class-struggle theory at greater or lesser length, but one of the most succinct statements of it is that of G. Deville, of high Socialist repute, found in his booklet, *Socialism, Internationalism and Revolution*, 11. For another plain statement, cf. Kauffman's *What Is Socialism?* Chap. V, "War of the Classes."

² Cf. *Common Sense of Socialism*, John Spargo; *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, Morris Hillquit; *Evolution of Property*, Paul Lafargue; *Philosophy of Socialism* (an economic instead of a philosophic dissertation), A. M. Simons, all of which are widely read in Socialist circles.

IV. OWNERSHIP

Socialists hold that it is wrong for a man to own property he does not use, or use property he does not own. They say that what is personally used should be personally owned and what is collectively used should be collectively owned, for in this manner alone can the exploitation and robbery of labor be stopped. The prevailing system of ownership appears to them to violate justice in each of the particulars indicated. On the one hand some persons own much more than they can use; and on the other, many persons, in order barely to live, are required to use what they do not own. Socialists conceive that this system makes the user, the laborer, dependent upon the owner, the capitalist, and as a result of this dependency, the laborer is required to pay the capitalist a tribute, wrung from his hard toil, for the mere privilege of living by the use of another's property. This tribute may take the form of rent, interest, dividends or profits, which are only separate names for surplus value; but in any event it is taken from the product of labor. Hence, the Socialists say, the prevailing system of ownership, which entails the loss to labor of a part, and much the greater part, of its product, is manifestly contrary to justice.

To remedy this condition, Socialists propose that no person should own property that another person uses, and, so far as is possible, every person should own the property that he uses, while property that more than one uses is to be collectively owned. The object of Socialist ownership is to make it impossible for one person to acquire surplus value, or profit, dividend, interest or

rent, through the labor of another. But this can be accomplished only by making it impossible for one person to acquire the labor of another, and this, in turn, can be accomplished only by the public asserting ownership and control of all of the instruments for production and distribution that might be used by one person while owned by another.¹

The details of the theories of value, surplus value, the class struggle, and ownership,—which go to make up the Socialist principle of economics,—are bewildering in their number and variety, but the foregoing is a comprehensive and accurate outline. A striking feature of these theories is the continuity of thought that links them together. With a precision that all but justifies their use of the term scientific, Socialists refer the several phases of their principle of economics to its basic formula: Labor is the source of all value. If the principle thus broadly indicated be made to appear reasonable, Socialists, theoretically, can urge its minor divisions with considerable force. Labor being the source of all value, surplus labor must be the source of surplus value, and a struggle between classes for its control becomes inevitable, and collective ownership seems the only feasible plan that will afford relief. But if the proposition that

¹ As to precisely what property Socialists propose to own, we shall consider when treating of the "Aims of Socialism." The reason for the demand for collective ownership must not be lost sight of: "The making of goods for profit must come to an end" (Socialist platform (U. S.), 1904), because "no wage can ever be fair compensation for a day's work" (*Industrial Problems*, Richardson) and "the cry for a fair wage is an insane wish never to be fulfilled" (*Value, Price and Profit*, Marx).

labor is the source of all value be shown to be unreasonable, this very coherency of thought in Socialist economics is fatal in effect. This consideration has induced the postponement of the objections deemed pertinent, to the end that their bearing on the whole principle under discussion would be readily seen.

V. OBJECTIONS

1. *The root fallacy.*

The strength of the Socialist argument is the assumption that, in the course of exchange, the parties demand equivalents. This demand necessitates a measure of both that which is given and that which is received in exchange. To determine on this measure requires in all articles of exchange a common characteristic by which they can be measured. This common characteristic is found to be labor. The force of the entire argument is thus seen to depend upon the validity of the assumption that equal values are demanded by the parties to an exchange. If this be true, a unit of value that is common to all commodities must be found and it is difficult to imagine what could serve this purpose more nearly than labor. But if it be not true, then the whole structure of Socialist economics comes tumbling down like a house of cards.

On reflection, however, it is plain that the parties to an exchange do not demand equal values in the exchange. If they did there would be no reason for an exchange. Between commodities that are of equal value, and that have no other characteristic except value, there can be no intelligent choice and there can be no purposive ex-

change of them. The truth is that exchange occurs only when values are believed by both parties to be unequal. Each party prefers that which he acquires to that which he relinquishes in the exchange. The very inducement of the exchange is the belief on the part of each party that what he receives is more valuable to him than what he gives.

It should be borne in mind that Socialists do not allow that a commodity possesses any other than a value-characteristic so long as it is a commodity, which it certainly is at the time of the exchange; hence, they may not say that the exchange of equal values is induced by reason of some characteristic other than value. The assumption that equal values are demanded in exchange, is indulged by many who are not Socialists, but as applied by them it is not altogether fallacious because they allow that characteristics other than value attach to commodities, and these may induce exchange when values are equal. Socialists vitiate the little truth the assumption carries as used by others, when they exclude from the commodity they describe every characteristic except value. Moreover, it is necessary for them to exclude all others. For with all their ingenuity they cannot measure utility, rarity, oddity, beauty, style, or the many other characteristics that go to make up desirability,—they cannot gauge or estimate these by any of their various conceptions of labor, actual or abstract. Thus, the Socialists are hedged in on all sides. They are not able to imagine an intelligent exchange of equal values, or to allow that anything but values are exchanged. And thus, as an abstract theory, the Socialist principle of economics appears to be fatally defective at the very root.

2. *The practical folly.*

While the fallacious assumption that only equivalents are normally exchanged, is probably the most ruinous defect in the Socialist theory as a pure theory, there are other objections that seem quite as fatal to its application. Chief among these is the one found in applying that elusive if not meaningless term, social labor. There are ways of setting out pure nonsense in such fashion that the mind of man, not seriously reflecting, slips quite readily from one absurdity into another. Socialists are not the least experienced in this artful method of enunciation. They are aware that the average human intellect, like a moving body, follows the line of least resistance, and consequently they adopt, and, with an admirable display of ingenuity, adhere to, a plan which does not remove but seeks to avoid obvious difficulties, which does not discover but endeavors to keep hidden the obscure ones, and to this end they distinguish and differentiate and qualify with a zeal and a cleverness that might grace a better cause.

The term, social labor, serves this purpose of Socialists to a nicety. It overrides facts with the reckless abandon of a rebel archangel; assumes labor to exist where it does not, and denies its presence where it is perfectly obvious. The labor necessary to produce any commodity is just exactly the labor that produces it,—which differs with every different workman, every different stroke, and every different thought employed,—in every different minute of time and every different place in the world,—in quantity, quality, intensity, duration, skill. If two commodities ever were produced by precisely the same kind and quantity of labor, it was altogether due to

chance and is wholly impossible to determine. More nearly an infinite variant can hardly be imagined than the labor under different conditions necessary to produce a given commodity. No amount of word-juggling can do away with this variance or reduce it to a standard. Facts cannot be made to fit a theory; theory must conform to facts. It goes "trippingly on the tongue" for Socialists to talk about "ordinarily necessary labor," "labor on the average necessary," "normally necessary labor," "social labor," etc., and when these phrases are permitted to pass unchallenged, they make just the impression needed to wing the thought-free mind from one false principle to another. But when they are halted midway in their flight and examined, they prove to be as hollow as Dead Sea fruit, clashing with facts, supposing the non-existent to exist, and assuming the impossible to be accomplished. Not until human activity in all its phases gives place to mechanical devices, and the wants and wishes of society are realized by the touch of a button, can we intelligently speak of "ordinarily necessary labor," or the like.

3. *The social injustice.*

Another objection to the Socialist formula is its failure to allow for the different kinds of labor that persons perform. In the assumption that equivalents are demanded in the course of exchange, there is a logical absurdity; in the restriction of the term labor to what is termed social labor, there is a practical absurdity; in the failure to recognize the obvious differences that obtain in labor performed, there is a manifest injustice. That there is a difference not only in the labor-power but in the very labor of different persons, is a fact too obvious for dis-

pute. That this difference results in the production of different values, is equally beyond question. Nor can it be easily conceived how any just standardization of these differences is possible. The laws might be framed to attempt such a feat; the governmental powers can arbitrarily ignore even the most evident facts; but this would not root out the inborn sense of justice that ennobles the human race. Neither law nor logic can suspend the facts that bear on the question,—the labor of one man is often more productive than that of another, the product of one is often superior to that of another, the differences are independent of the cost of labor-power, but dependent on the will, the energy, the intelligence, the skill, talent or genius of the man. Theorists may willfully shut their eyes to these facts, like Mohammed seeking to uproot a mountain by the sound of his voice; but they, like the Moslem bluffer, must finally acknowledge the eternal truth that whatever is, is. The sad feature of their delusive folly is that after its exposure even, many blind fanatics will be ready to overturn the world for the sake of the very leaders who have deceived them.

“The lover may distrust the look that steals his soul away,
The alchemist may doubt the gold his crucibles fling out,
But faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast
To some dear falsehood, holds it to the last.”

If we could compare the amounts of the “necessities of life” consumed by a Mme. Curie, a Saint-Gaudens, an Edison, a Whitcomb Riley, with the amounts consumed by an equal number of persons engaged in cleaning a city thoroughfare, we would doubtless find that the consumption of the laborers is signally the greater. Ac-

According to Socialist theory, this means that their labor-power is the more costly or more valuable and their labor-time should be the better paid. In illustrating this phase of their theory, Socialists very adroitly assume that it costs more to produce and maintain the labor-power of a skilled mechanic than of a plain workman, and more to produce that of an artist than of a mechanic, but this is only an instance of their thimble-rigging methods. Nothing could be wider of the truth. It is both a notable and a natural fact that muscle consumes more than mind of physical things. The cost of the labor-power spent in designing St. Peter's probably was no greater than the cost of that spent by Michel Angelo's servingman while putting away his master's summer garments. The labor-power of one person may cost little but produce much, while that of another may cost much but produce little. "Some men are born great, some achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them." It is not uncommon for a person with first-rate and costly opportunities to fail in the battle with life, while at the same time another person, who, like Topsy, "jes growed," overrides all obstacles in the way of splendid achievement. The former is really a hindrance to society, and the latter is a help to it, but the Socialist theory requires the greater reward for him who does the least, because, forsooth, his labor-power has cost more. Socialists will promptly disown a wrong so flagrant, but if the logic of things is not mistaken, this consequence results inevitably when their gauge of value is driven to its practical conclusion. Their effort to avoid this consequence only evinces the readiness common to pretenders to "go to the mountain" when necessary. It shows,

too, that whatever may be the convictions of their followers, the Socialist teachers are awake to the fact that, notwithstanding their energetic claims, their whole scheme of economics is illogical, impractical, unjust.

4. *The surplus value bogey.*

While the theory of surplus value falls with the fall of the theory of value, upon which it depends, still this theory is such a fruitful source of Socialist propaganda and enthusiasm that it claims some special attention. The surplus-value idea is subject to the same fatal trinity of objections that has been urged against its parent principle,—it does not square with logic or with facts or with justice. It is based, if not upon an impossible, at least upon an undeterminable hypothesis. Whether a workman produces more or less than he consumes during his life cannot possibly be determined. Hence, it can never be clear and certain that he has produced a surplus value. This is equally true of every class of workingmen. It is not even remotely possible to determine either the amount of production or the amount of consumption. No number of statistics can show to what extent railroads, highways, churches, schools, libraries, hospitals, etc., are used by a class and in part consumed. And of production, though it is conceivably possible to determine the amount a class produces of the simpler products that require no education, tools, or like previously acquired means for production, this is not true with respect to products whose production requires previously acquired means. Persons may not make use of these means, which they do not themselves produce, and then lay claim to the whole of the product that by use of them they are enabled to effect. Nor can the respective con-

tributions of the man and the means be apportioned. Socialists make an attempt at this. They say that a machine, for instance, contributes as much work to the product as the machine itself embodies.¹ But this is only substituting one difficulty for another. The machine also is a product, and those who produced it also use means not produced by them. Excluding *all* previously acquired means for production, it is difficult to imagine what could be produced by a person's own labor. The imaginative genius of Defoe was baffled by just such a difficulty, and he was compelled to supply his "Crusoe" with knife, gun, saw,—a generous tool chest, in fact, but above all, with wide experience and a surprising amount of practical information, and then Crusoe had great difficulty in producing more than a livelihood. Moreover, while thus feebly attacking the difficulty at one point with their example of the machine, Socialists pass over the fact that machinery is only one among innumerable factors that have been produced by previously expended labor and which co-operate with the instant labor in the process of production. Every achievement of the human race that has been made in the direction of increased productive capacity since its very beginning,—and Socialists teach that there is no achievement but was made in this direction,—must be considered when considering whether a workingman of to-day, by virtue of his own labor, produces more than he consumes.

Thus it seems a manifest error to assume that there is a surplus product created by any person or class. It

¹ "It makes no difference how useful a machine may be, if it costs but 50 days' labor it can add only that value to its product" (*Principles Scientific Socialism*, Vail, 39).

appears more probable that instead of producing more than they consume, most persons of all classes in the course of life consume more than they produce. When Socialists declaim about unpaid labor, exploitation, robbery, etc., they fail to take in *all* the elements that enter into production. When with a uniformity that, in view of the premises, argues less of deduction than of design, they set forth that the average workman is wrongfully deprived of four-fifths of his own product, they only elaborate an absurd fiction. But there is mischief in their propaganda despite its obvious futility. That a person is justly entitled to all *he* produces, is clear to everyone, and when one is persuaded that he is being systematically deprived of the greater part of his own product, and that the laws of his country afford no relief from such shameful wrongdoing, he is prepared to go any length to establish what he feels to be his just demands. The disposition thus aroused in the working classes that heed the Socialist outcry, is one of the chief forces back of the Socialist movement. It is a force that begins with a mere persuasion, but it grows into conviction, and thus furnishes the movement with an energy and a desperation that promise grave complications. If there is a class struggle anywhere in society, here is its origin. It is not the cause of Socialism, but the effect. It is engendered by Socialist propagandists who spare no pains to spread broadcast their inflammatory teachings. It is as broad as the field of their activity and as deadly as their effort at driving home its purpose is successful.

5. *The impossible class-struggle.*

There is about as much reason to suppose that there is an inherent and necessary conflict between capital and

labor, as to believe that the fabled dispute between the upper and nether millstones about which of them ground more of the miller's corn, is anything more real than a fable. When two or more factors are alike necessary to effect a result, it is idle to speculate which contributes most to the result. Natural resources, animal energy, and human intelligence are alike necessary for our civilization. The bringing of these factors together is a process of unification, not of conflict. Conflict means dissolution. Labor flows from animal energy and human intelligence combined; capital, from labor and natural resources combined. All that goes to make up our material civilization is the result of bringing together labor and capital. One or another of the primal factors may predominate in a particular instance,—intelligence in the labor of the artist, energy in that of the ditch-digger; in machine capital, labor; in landed capital, natural resources,—but the predominance shifts from time to time and from one instance to another, and always, the factors merge as it were in such a way as to be indistinguishable when embodied in the product they effect.

Since the combined factors mentioned produce civilization, in order to perpetuate itself civilization must make returns to them whereby they will be perpetuated, and, too, if civilization would advance, its return to these factors must improve them. This delicate adjustment of returns would not be possible on the hypothesis that there is an inherent conflict between labor and capital. Nothing would be more certain to halt the advance of civilization than a state of perpetual friction, not to say warfare, between these two chief factors in its production. In the long processes of material development in

the past, there are many instances of such a friction, and in every instance it has operated as a check on the progress of the human race. But wherever labor and capital have stood united, the march of both has been forward,—a consideration that should bring pause to the malcontents who would set them at loggerheads.

6. *The collectivist fatality.*

The norms of advancing civilization are not invariable, but two are necessary. They are: competition and justice. Competition is the law of achievement; justice, the law of reward. One insures advancement; the other, permanence. Both are essential to true progress. When justice is violated, revolution begins. Competition cannot be too keen, nor justice too exact, for the welfare of society, so long as the object of the one is merely greater achievement and that of the other only due reward. Injustice arises when competition is for reward greater than achievement. Just as promptly, competition begins to lag, when reward is not commensurate with achievement. To insure progress and permanence, the two must move along parallel lines, properly balanced, equally broad, equally enduring. The preservation of this balance should be the chief object of Government,—to prevent the stifling of competition and to secure the reward that is due. No better arrangement for this can be imagined than the system of private ownership, supplemented by laws whereby free competition is insured and undue advantage is prohibited and crowned by charity, whereby the unable and the unfit who fail in competition are cared for.² The surplus-value

² The indulgence of the reader is asked if some of the suggestions here made are repeated in the fourth chapter of Part

theory makes a curse of competition and a crime of property and in view of it charity is but a poor restitution of property that has been robbed from a helpless class in society. Collective ownership would abrogate competition, and the advancement of the human race would be arrested, if not turned back, as a consequence. More on this subject will appear in that part of our study which treats of the "Aims of Socialism."

Third, where a fuller discussion of the laws governing the right distribution of reward is set out by way of a suggestion. It may be well here to suggest that the last four chapters of Part Third bear an important relation to the present chapter and in the final estimate of Socialism should be considered in connection with them.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PHILOSOPHIC PRINCIPLE

I. METHOD

The two distinctive notes of Socialist philosophy are its dialectic method and its materialistic content. The first was adopted from Hegel, the second from Feuerbach. G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1831) was one of the classical German idealists. According to his philosophy, thought and being are identical; matter, as distinct from mind, does not exist; the seeming variety of matter exists only in the mind; its seeming variation is the evolution of thought. This evolution embraces three successive stages: thesis, antithesis, synthesis. That is to say, thought (thesis) generates its own negation (antithesis), and these opposites resolve themselves into a higher unity (synthesis), which, though another distinct being, is only thought (thesis), from which another procession begins. In other words, thought is first itself, then becomes other than itself, then changes from its otherness back to itself, having by this easy manœuvre somehow improved upon its former self so as to be a new being. Hegel conceives this evolution as going on eternally; there is nothing immutable, but all is changing; nothing inactive, but all moving; nothing final, but all beginning; the one fixed thing in the universe is the fixed law that nothing is fixed. He epitomises his whole

system of philosophy in his famous expression: "Nothing is, everything is becoming."

This method of reasoning, if it may out of courtesy be called reasoning, has received the name "dialectic." It is distinguished from metaphysical reasoning in that it recognizes no universal first principles. Kant has the questionable distinction of having been the first man of note to dispute recognized first principles of thought, such as the principle of contradiction, which he opposed with his doctrine of *Antinomies*. But Hegel follows close after and even "outrasons" Kant by identifying existence with non-existence, cause with effect, and self with something else, thus robbing the human mind of its primary concepts and thereby committing intellectual suicide. If a thing may be said to be and at the same time not to be, or to be itself and at the same time something else, it is perfectly useless to affirm this or that of anything in the universe, for another may affirm the exact contrary, and neither can be convicted of error. With the universal first principles of reason abrogated, sense and nonsense embrace one another inseparably and forever.

Socialist philosophy is adapted to the method of the Hegelian school. Karl Marx and his collaborator, Frederick Engels, the accredited founders of Scientific Socialism, rejected metaphysics and used dialectics in their philosophical system and this original impress is the distinctive mark of the entire field of Socialist thought. The following paragraphs from the writings of these men will not only show their attitude toward, but will also further elucidate, the dialectic method.

"Truth is not a collection of ready-made, dogmatic

statements; truth lay in the *process* of knowledge. . . . Dialectic philosophy destroyed all theories of absolute truth. In face of it, nothing final, absolute or sacred exists; and nothing can exist before it save the unbroken process of coming into existence and passing away.”¹ “One cannot be any longer imposed upon by the inflated, unsubstantial antithesis of the metaphysics of true and false, good and evil, identical and differentiated, necessary and accidental.”² “To the metaphysician, things and their mental reflexes (ideas) are isolated . . . fixed, rigid, given once for all. For him a thing either exists or does not exist, a thing cannot at the same time be itself and something else, positive and negative exclude one another, cause and effect stand in antithesis to one another. . . . But Nature works dialectically and not metaphysically. An exact knowledge of the universe, of the development of mankind, can only be obtained by the method of dialectics.”³ Anticipating the objection that his dialectic method is at variance with common sense, Engels facetiously remarks that “common sense, respectable fellow that he is in the homely realm of his own four walls, has very wonderful adventures directly he ventures out into the wide world of research.”⁴

But the idealism of Hegel did not appeal to the Socialist philosophers. It savored too much “of the fantastical survival of the belief in the existence of a

¹ *Feuerbach*, Engels, 38.

² *Ibid.*, 97.

³ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, Engels, 79. This work, though bearing the name of Engels only, is the joint production of Marx and Engels.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 80

supra-mundane creator.”⁵ Hegel’s system was an ideal evolutionary pantheism, but Marx and Engels would not subscribe to theism of any sort, so to get rid of Hegel’s pantheism, they rejected his idealism, and his dialectics, thus detached from its original base, they inverted and rested on the materialism of Feuerbach.

II. CONTENT

Ludwig Feuerbach (1804–1872) was the arch-materialist of his day. His teaching is diametrically opposed in both method and content to the Hegelian school. Hegel conceived the all-inclusive principle of the universe to be mind; Feuerbach denied the reality of the mind as distinguished from matter. Hegel’s “mind” was in constant process of evolution; Feuerbach’s “matter” only varied. The two systems are similar in that both are monistic, recognizing only one principle in all being. But contradictory in that one is pure idealism and the other pure materialism, and one is evolving while the other is fixed. As Marx and Engels rejected Hegel’s idealism, so they rejected Feuerbach’s immutableism. They held with the latter that matter is the eternal, all-inclusive principle of the universe. But they adopted the former’s view that the universe was in a constant process of evolution, not mere variation. The distinction between evolution and variation may be elucidated by considering variation as a change with reference to a fixed standard, and evolution as a change without reference to a standard. Socialists illustrate this distinction by the use of two symbols, the circle and the spiral. In the cir-

⁵ *Feuerbach*, Engels, 63.

cle all lines move with reference to the center. Each line of the spiral has a direction entirely its own. The first represents variation, the second evolution.¹

Engels has given us an elaborate analysis of the mental processes through which Marx and himself arrived at their conclusion to combine in a new philosophy parts of the two systems of Hegel and Feuerbach. "Feuerbach held quite correctly," he says, "that scientific materialism is the foundation for the building of human knowledge. But it is not the building itself. We live not only in nature, but in human society, which has its theory of development no less than nature. It was necessary, therefore, to bring the science of society into harmony with the materialistic foundations and to rebuild upon them."² In another place Engels tells us that Hegel's system, while true in method, lacked the proper foundation: "In Hegel's system, the whole world, natural, historical, intellectual, is truly represented as a *process*, i.e. as in constant motion, change, transformation, development."³ This is dialectic evolution. But as seen by Hegel, "in spite of all zigzag movements, it is only the self-progression of the Idea from eternity," and since matter and not mind is the true foundation of evolution, according to Engels, "this topsy-turvy ideology had to be put aside. Therefore the

¹ This illustration is used by Enrico Ferri, in his *Socialism and Modern Science*. He adopts it from Goethe. It is not apt. The lines of a spiral are directed by *two* fixed points, a center and a perpendicular. The spiral is a symbol not of creative evolution but of development directed by two intelligences: God and man.

² *Feuerbach*, 70.

³ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 85.

dialectic of Hegel was turned upside down, or rather it was placed upon its feet instead of upon its head, where it was standing before.”⁴ Marx has given us an epitome of his conclusions also: “My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but directly opposite. To Hegel the process of *thinking* . . . is the demiurgos of the real world, the real world is only the external form of the ‘Idea.’ With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the mind and translated into forms of thought. Hegel’s dialectic is standing on its head and it must be turned right side up again to discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell.”⁵

Accordingly, Marx and Engels founded a new system of philosophy, an evolutionary materialistic monism, that combines the dialectic of Hegel with the materialism of Feuerbach, that represents the universe as purely material and constantly changing without reference to any standard from itself to its otherness and then back to itself; a universe where, they say, “nothing but matter exists,” where “the ideal is nothing but the material reflected by the human brain,” where “thought and thinking matter are identical,” where “a final conclusion, a complete humanity, a finished society, a perfect state, an eternal existence, an unchangeable truth, are only phantasies.”⁶

⁴ *Feuerbach*, 96.

⁵ *Capital*, Marx, preface to 2nd edition.

⁶ Cf. *Holy Family*, *Anti-Duehring*, *Critique of Political Economy*, in each of which Marx and Engels set out their philosophy with more or less detail but substantially as in their other works cited.

III. THEORY OF THE UNIVERSE

Cosmology, biology, and anthropology, respectively, treat of inorganic, organic, and human existence. Since these are distinct existences, those are distinct sciences. Toward the middle of the nineteenth century, however, the well-defined character of these sciences came to be disputed by Lamarck, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Mill, and others of the neo-materialistic schools of radical evolutionism that sprang up during that period of extravagant and perverted thought. In its popular acceptance, "Darwinism" has come to be understood as including most of the various evolutionary theories of that time, and also, most of the present-day theories that account for the origin of existence by evolution. Extravagance and perversity are dominant characteristics of Darwinism,—extravagance in making an observation the basis for a universal law, perversity in stubbornly refusing to acknowledge self-evident truths. A Darwinist will "demonstrate" more hypotheses by an unassignable fragment of a nameless fossil than the rest of mankind will venture to predicate on the seasons and the planets and the courses of the stars. He will question a mathematical axiom as readily as others will question the existence of the Brobdignagians.

Darwinism is admirably adapted to the development of the Hegel-Feuerbach hybrid of dialectic materialism that Marx and Engels produced. Socialists generally have not been slow to perceive this adaptability, and, as a consequence, Darwinism has come to be accepted by them as the last word in experimental and philosophic science. With perfect complacency Scientific Socialists

will deliver themselves of statements utterly gratuitous and absurd, as if the accumulated intelligence of past ages had verified them. They out-Darwin Darwin in their theories, but all who presume to question their vain imaginings are condemned as having "no part or lot in the intellectual life."¹

According to the Socialist theory of the universe the distinction among inorganic, organic, and human existences, is a distinction having no foundation in fact. It claims for all being, whether known or imaginable, the same life, consciousness, and will. These attributes evolve, spiral-like, from nebulæ to protoplasm, from protoplasm to cell, from cell to organism, resulting finally in man, the highest order of being possible. The following paragraphs, condensed from the work of a writer on Socialist philosophy, will illuminate this theory and show the extent of the vagaries of Socialist science.

"In the dim past we see an infinite mass of infinitesimally minute particles of ether-dust whirling about in all directions. Here is life with all its attributes. Consciousness and will are among these attributes, just as are electricity, magnetism, indestructibility, impenetrability. This picture shows all there is in the universe at that remote stage. This is the cosmos, god, infinite, that created itself out of itself. In the evolution of this ether-universe, the positive life of a certain stage generates its own negation. The negative forces later dominate the positive forces and transform them into negative ones. In their turn, they generate their own negation, which in due time brings about the negation of

¹ *Evolution: Social and Organic*, A. M. Lewis, 42.

the previous negation. Out of the universal whirl more condensed whirls gradually arrange themselves. Æons pass, and the whirls become worlds. Other æons pass, and the first organic life arises. Through the interaction of organic and inorganic life-processes is produced the cell-nucleus. Other specifications follow in due time." This gifted writer goes on to describe the "other specifications" that follow, illumining one after another of the cosmic periods with the light of his biological erudition, finally reaching the Tertiary period, when, he says, "the man-ape becomes an ape-man, the further accentuation of which results in the birth of man."²

This theory of the universe leaves much to be desired. The world "created itself out of itself," is a statement manifestly offensive to the principles of causality, contradiction, and identity, and cannot be sincerely entertained by a fault-free intellect. To create presupposes existence in the creator; to be created presupposes non-existence in the created; for a thing to create itself presupposes existence and non-existence in the same thing at the same time. For a thing to be created out of itself presupposes non-existence and existence at the same time. But passing the point of origin, the Socialist's cosmos, however created, becomes extinct when it "generates its own negation." Whether it possesses "life with all its attributes" or barely exists, this first move or change imagined in the Socialist's world destroys it. The negation of life is death. The negation of existence is extinction.

² *Science and Revolution*, E. Untermann, 175 sq. to 184. The quotations are *verbatim*, but for convenience, extracts from several paragraphs are run together.

In truth, this entire theory is obviously open to so many valid and fatal objections that it is unnecessary to enumerate them. And yet we are told with a pious show of concern that all who do not agree with this theory "are an unreasoning herd who merely acknowledge their mental poverty, who deceive themselves and others and bar the progress of the human mind,"³ that notwithstanding this theory "has wiped out the line of demarkation between mankind, animals and plants . . . between organic and inorganic matter . . . nevertheless, orthodoxy, in the disguise of metaphysics and 'true' religion, continues to dodge around in the old way and rest on its unproven [*sic*] assertions."⁴ This painstaking philosopher is not without consolation, however, for he perceives the "vital truth and strength" of his philosophy "demonstrated by the fact that it has been accepted by the proletariat in all countries."⁵ The undertaking to combat an egotism so complacent as that indicated is only a waste of energy.

It is refreshing to turn to that theory of the universe which involves *no* contradictions, which has the sanction of revelation, which is the true theory.

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; And God said: Be light made. And light was made (1st day of creation). And God made a firmament (2nd day). God also said: Let the waters be gathered together in one place, and let the dry land appear. And He said: Let the earth bring

³ *Science and Revolution*, 171.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 158, 159. Cf. also, 140.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 127.

forth. And the earth brought forth the green herb, and such as yieldeth seed, and the tree that beareth fruit (3rd day). And God made two great lights: a greater light to rule the day, and a lesser light to rule the night: and the stars (4th day). God also said let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly. And God created every living and moving creature, which the waters brought forth, and every winged fowl (5th day). And God said: Let the earth bring forth cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth. And it was so done. And He said: Let us make man to our image and likeness; and let him have dominion over the whole earth, and every creature that moveth upon the earth. And God created man to His own image (6th day). On the seventh day God rested from all His work.

It is not infrequently said, occasionally by persons having some general claim to recognition, that modern science has disclosed certain particulars in which this story of creation is at variance with the facts. But this statement is not warranted. Science has gone far to verify the biblical narrative of creation, but it has not impeached this narrative in any particular. Much is made of the fact that it is said God created the world in six "days," whereas it is beyond question that the occurrences mentioned occupied vast spaces of time. But it is obvious that the "days" mentioned by the sacred writer do not refer to the rising and the setting of the sun, for the sun itself was not created until the fourth "day." Nor do they refer to a revolution of the earth on its axis, or to the movement of the stars, which is our broadest conception of a day, for the firmament was

not created and there was no earth separate from the "heaven and the earth" until the second "day." It may with point be further remarked that it is said: "And on the seventh day God rested from all His work." This prompts the question: How long is the seventh "day"? The "myth" in the story of the six-days' creation, therefore, is not in the story, but in the mind of those who burden it with a construction that clearly was not intended by the sacred writer. It is admitted by Hebrew scholars that the word "Yom," which Moses used in the narration, may be construed as an indefinite "period" of time. "Day," therefore, as it appears in this scriptural account, may be said to mean that period which in the light of science is shown to be the period during which each of the creations mentioned existed before the next order of existence was brought into being.

But when we go beyond the surface, we find positive evidence of the scientific truth of the scriptural narrative of creation. In its description of the universe before there was light, it coincides perfectly with accepted scientific theory. First, "God created the heaven and the earth." This was "in the beginning." At that time, the "earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." This is precisely as the scientist conceives the world to have been at some time in the æons past. Scientists have discovered what are called "ether waves" or "ether dust," which is the medium upon which electricity travels, the particles of which are finer than the finest air. By a few giant leaps of the mind the earth is conceived as dissolved, the sun as broken up, the stars as blotted out, the entire universe as being reduced to these "infinitesimally minute particles of mat-

ter called ether-dust," without form, without motion, without heat, or life, or light. In fine, by dint of some four thousand years of research, science has reached the conclusion, so long ago plainly expressed by the sacred writer, that in the beginning the earth was void and had no form and darkness was everywhere. Here science halts, helpless. What gave to matter its form, motion, heat, light and life? Science cannot answer. The scriptures do: "And God said: Be light made. And light was made." Science then bridges the gap. It discovers that light is only a form of heat, heat only a form of motion, motion only a form of matter. The sacred writer is not supposed to have known these facts discovered only centuries after his time. But it cannot be reasonably doubted that when Moses wrote: "And light was made," he might have written with equal truth, though with less sublime brevity, that form, motion, heat, and light were made in that "day" or stage of creation first after the "beginning."

Another salient feature of this narrative is quite impressive. It is related that on the fifth "day," or in the fifth stage, there was created "every living and moving creature which the waters brought forth, and every winged fowl." How did the narrator of this story, written more than three thousand years ago, know that fish and fowl belong to the same genetic class when scientists have only in recent years discovered this fact? He evidently *did* know it, since he makes them both the object of one creative act. The most rigid scrutiny of this story of creation will not bring out a single particular in which it is at issue with accepted science. On the contrary, it is only confirmed and illuminated by scien-

tific discoveries, which from Newton's discovery of the law of motion to the latest demonstration in experimental embryology, go to point out the indisputable truth of this sublime story of the creation of the world.

IV. "ECONOMIC DETERMINISM"

The Socialist theory of economic determinism, also variously called "The Materialistic Conception of History," "Historical Materialism," "Social Evolution," "Marxian Darwinism," etc., explains the sociological as distinguished from the biological world. It does not distinguish the essential character of social life from that of biological life, but only notes another degree of evolutionary development. This theory is a continuation or extension of the theory of the universe. It is an application to human society from its beginning of the principles and the consequences of dialectic materialistic monism.

This theory conceives man as originally in a low state of savagery, that state having been reached through an infinite series of gyrations, such as Untermann describes. Out of millions of years of this crazy whirling, by way of the monkey, came man. Not man as we perceive him: "How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and being how express and admirable!" But man as a wild savage—half man, half brute, a hungry animal that lived by force and reproduced by instinct. What a splendid concept! How puerile by comparison is the thought that man was made in the image of God! How worthy the indignation of Engels, when he says that "to continue to talk of a Creator is an insult to the human intelligence"!

With this idea, Socialism begins to trace an imaginary history of the human race. The events in this history are not determined by man, but by his surroundings; not by intelligence, but by the food supply. In this history, God is ignored, free-will is denied, the very consciousness of human beings is attributed to their material environment. "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their lives," Marx assures us, "but on the contrary, it is the social life that determines their consciousness."¹ Marx does not here mean that men are largely influenced by their surroundings, as every one admits. He means, and he at once takes pains to say it, that regardless of their own volition men are prompted, directed, controlled, have their consciousness and hence their thoughts, words, and actions, *determined* by their environment: "Men enter upon necessary relations independent of their wills . . . the sum total of these relations forms the economic structure of society, the real basis on which all social structures are built and to which social consciousness corresponds. The method of producing a material livelihood, determines the social, political and intellectual life in general."² Engels expresses this determinism thus: "The final causes of all social changes are to be sought not in men's brains, not in a better insight into truth and justice, but in the modes of production and exchange; not in the philosophy but in the economics of each particular period."³ He says

¹ Preface to *Critique of Political Economy*. Cf. also, *Capital*, Vol. IV, 324.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 94. Cf. also, Engels' *Duehring*, 233.

in another instance: "The production of the material means of life forms the foundation from which the institutions of a people, their law, art, religion even, have been developed, and according to which they are to be explained."⁴

If it is possible to put this fatalistic theory in plainer language, the Italian Socialist Labriola perhaps has done so in the following language: "The production of the means of life, *determines*, in the first place and *directly*, all the rest of the practical activity of society, and the variations of this activity in the *processus* which we call history, the formation, friction, struggles and erosions of the classes, the corresponding law and morality; in fine, that which gives birth to the State and that which constitutes it. It determines in the second place the tendency and in great part the objects, of imagination and thought, in art, religion and science."⁵

The history of the human race, indeed of all things animate or inanimate, is nothing more than the operation of this law of economic determinism. Says Enrico Ferri, a gifted Socialist, for many years the recognized leader of the Socialist movement in Italy: "This law is truly the most scientific and the most prolific sociological theory that has ever been discovered by the genius of man. It furnishes an explanation of social history in its most magnificent dramas as well as of personal history in its most trivial episodes."⁶ These "magnificent dramas" are divided by Socialists into Savagery, Barbarism, Feu-

⁴ The keynote utterance of Engels' speech at the grave of Marx on the occasion of his funeral.

⁵ *Materialistic Conception of History*, 201.

⁶ *Socialism and Modern Science*, 159.

dalism, Capitalism. The next will be Socialism. The mode of social life corresponding to these stages of human development are Cannibalism, Slavery, Serfdom, Wagedom. Next will be Co-operation. The cause of transition from one stage to another is explained in terms of economic determinism: Cannibalism, which was the natural mode of life for man just emerged from monkeydom, gave place to Slavery, because, with the development of man's ability to produce, it was seen to be more profitable to put him to work than to eat him. Slavery was displaced by Serfdom, because the support of the great number of slaves who grew up, became a burden to their masters, especially during unproductive seasons, and it was seen that more profit could be secured by arranging it so that the slaves would have to support themselves during such times, which was done by the Feudal system. The transition to Wagedom followed, when the ruling classes perceived that, in spite of feudal laws, the ever increasing productive capacity of the workers was enabling them more than barely to exist. This meant that something of their product was escaping the capitalist's maw, and the system of wages was instituted in order to capture that surplus value. Such is a "bird's-eye-view" of history as a Scientific Socialist describes it. "There has been progress," he says, "but not through aspiration toward righteousness. The dominant idea of progress, if it is necessary to specify one in particular, has been the striving after individual enrichment rather than toward a more perfect justice. The inventions and not the intentions of man have been the cause of progress."¹

¹ *The State and Socialism*, Gabrielle Deville, 15.

Economic determinism is found to be no less serviceable in the eyes of Socialists for drawing a still closer view of history. If there has been mechanical improvement, it was in order to increase the workingman's capacity for production; if religion, it was to induce him submissively to yield his product to an overlord while he himself looked toward heaven for his reward; if government, it was to secure to the ruling classes the advantages and the gains they acquired; if insurrection, revolution, war, conquest, discovery, emigration,—all was for the purpose of controlling or increasing the food supply. In fine, the animal called Man has developed from a protoplasmic germ to a Socialist philosopher much after the manner described by Lamarck in accounting for the giraffe's long neck, by "stretching for something to eat."

Without a doubt there are many avowing themselves Socialists who hesitate to surrender the high place in which art, law, science and religion most of all have enthroned the human race, who feel a sensible aversion to being stripped of autonomy, intelligence, and free will, and classed with "creeping things." But it is nevertheless true that "the philosophy of Socialism, as accepted by the Socialist parties of the world, takes as its fundamental hypothesis what has been variously called the materialistic conception of history, historical materialism, or economic determinism."⁸ The dialectic materialism of Marx and Engels has stamped its character upon Socialism as a movement, as a school of thought, as a philosophy of history and of life, and the leading Socialists of

⁸ A. M. Simons, writing in the *International Socialist Review*, of which he was then editor, June, 1904.

every country look with contempt on all Socialists who try to read into their doctrines any teaching contrary to economic determinism. "It can readily be proven affirmatively," writes a well-known American Socialist, "that the whole theory of Modern Socialism rests upon the foundation of historical materialism."⁹ "Marx's discovery that economic conditions constitute the determining cause of the moral, judicial, and political phenomena is one of the most important discoveries of modern times. It is by this and the law of surplus value that Socialism is reduced to a science."¹⁰ "Without the materialistic conception of history," says another, "scientific Socialism would be an impossibility."¹¹ "Socialism begins and ends with this," says Geo. D. Herron, for many years a recognized leader among American Socialists, "that the history of the world has been economic. The world's sentiments and religions, its laws and morals, its art and literature are all rooted in the struggle for control of the food supply."¹² Spargo says: "The *essential* characteristic of the Socialist theory is the idea variously termed 'Economic Determinism,' 'Historical Materialism,' 'The Economic Interpretation of History' and 'The Materialistic Conception of History.'"¹³ And again: "There have been many forces urging mankind onward; religion has played a part; love of country, climate and soil have been factors; but while these factors have exerted an influence, *back of them* have been

⁹ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, La Monte, 116.

¹⁰ *Socialist Movement*, Vail, 17.

¹¹ *Passing of Capitalism*, Ladoff, 75.

¹² Writing in the *Appeal to Reason* for May 16th, 1903.

¹³ *The Socialists*, 31.

the material economic conditions.”¹⁴ In fine, “Economic determinism is present in all utterances of American Socialism and constitutes the conscious basis of the movement in all its phases and it is employed in all Socialist literature, from the constructive pages of Robert Hunter to the revolutionary pamphlets of Debs and Hanford.”¹⁵

V. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

It is beside the question to enter upon a systematic refutation of Socialist philosophy. It will be sufficient to the present purpose to sum up by way of analysis what has preceded in this chapter and to pass on without further comment.

(I)

The Socialist method of thought is dialectic. It is based upon a negation of the eternal verities, denies that anything is fixed, unchangeable, final; affirms that nothing is, but everything is becoming. It disputes the recognized first principles of correct thought: the principle of contradiction, which holds that nothing can at the same time exist and not exist, or be true and not true; the principle of identity, which holds that nothing can at the same time be itself and something else; the principle of causality, which holds that nothing can be both cause and

¹⁴ *Common Sense of Socialism*, 71.

¹⁵ *American Socialism of the Present Day*, Jessie W. Hughan, ch. 4. John Spargo, writing the preface of this work for Miss Hughan, speaks of her as “a trustworthy guide through the labyrinthian paths which confront the serious student of American Socialism as it is to-day.”

effect of the same thing. If the dialectic method of thought be correct, these principles are incorrect.

(2)

The content of Socialist philosophy is radically materialistic. It stands opposed to the existence of mind as distinguished from matter; holds mind, soul, idea, to be a product of matter as translated by the material brain into forms of thought. It is essentially monistic; denies the existence of God, of spirit, of supernatural or immaterial life or existence.

(3)

Socialist philosophy is thus perceived to be a system of dialectic-materialistic-monism that holds the all-comprehensive principle of the universe to be matter, which is in a constant state of inconstancy(!), an invariable state of variation(!), a fixed state of evolution(!), which advances without reference to a standard towards a goal that has no existence (*sic*).

(4)

Considered in its relation to the origin of the universe and of life, Socialist philosophy disowns God, denies creation and wipes out the distinction among inorganic and organic beings. It holds man to be in no wise different from the lower animals, or from inanimate matter, except in that he represents an advanced state of evolutionary development of mere matter.

(5)

Considered in its relation to human nature and society, this philosophy by its theory of economic deter-

minism excludes personal intelligence, individual autonomy, and free-will. It holds that man is not self-conscious and not intellectually or morally responsible, his thoughts and his actions being pre-determined by his economic environment, which by its play and inter-play is constantly evolving itself and him toward some imaginary goal, where he will "for the first time be really marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom." It excludes, also, both the necessity and the occasion for constituted authority, whether human or divine, since one cannot be held amenable for conduct that is pre-determined by circumstances over which he has no control. It excludes, finally, all possible recognition of a Supreme Being, of a Sovereign State, of a just law, of home or property, of moral or social rights, relations and duties.¹

¹ Should it be said that no Socialist believes his philosophy would carry him to such execrable depths as are here indicated, refutation of the statement is furnished by many a bit of Socialist literature. A notable one, as brutal as it is plain, appears in the Socialist novel entitled *Not Guilty*, by Robert Blatchford, editor of the leading Socialist paper in England and author of several standard Socialist works, where at page 203 it is said: "If our heredity and our environment be good, we must act well, we cannot help it; if they be ill, we must act ill, we cannot help it. Suppose a tramp has murdered a child on the highway, has robbed her of a few coppers and has thrown her body into a ditch: Do you mean to say that tramp could not help doing that? Do you mean to say he is not to blame—not to be punished? Yes, I mean to say all of these things and if all of these things are not true, this book is not worth the paper it is written on." When we come to study the moral principle of Socialism, and the attitude of Socialists toward government and law, we shall find that this desperate attitude is not personal to Blatchford but characteristic of Scientific Socialists.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE

I. GODLESSNESS

Socialism cannot properly be said to have a religious principle. Religion, in its most comprehensive sense, is a recognition of some relation between God and man. Socialism excludes God. "In our evolutionary conception of the universe," says Engels,¹ "there is absolutely no room for either a Creator or a Ruler; and to talk of a Supreme Being . . . is a gratuitous insult to the feelings of religious people." The conclusion of Engels is in perfect accord with Socialist philosophy, which in method stands opposed to the concept of the eternal and in content denies the existence of the spiritual; and in accord also, with the theory of creative evolution and the doctrine of economic determinism, which empty God from the universe and cut off the possibility of human free will.

On its negative side, Socialism is profoundly atheistic. Throughout the breadth and intricacy of its sea of literature, which would school mankind to a new life in art, science, and government, there is scarce a page but in one way or another implies, if it does not teach, unbelief in God. So pronounced is this characteristic of un-

¹ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 19.

belief that, though there are many atheists who are not Socialists, the Socialists who are not atheists are indeed few. A well-known English Socialist says: "I cannot remember a single instance of a person who is at once a really intelligent Socialist and an orthodox believer."² Morris Hillquit estimates the percentage of atheists among the representative Socialists in America as ninety-nine in a hundred.³ A Socialist daily paper of New York says: "Socialism has no meaning unless it is atheistic, unless it declares we do not need so-called divine help."⁴ "There can be no doubt," writes the editor of another New York daily, "that the study of Socialism undermines religious belief. The theory of economic determinism alone, if thoroughly grasped, leaves no room for belief in the supernatural."⁵ August Bebel, until his recent death the leading exponent of Socialism in Germany, said: "I am convinced that a study of Socialism inevitably leads to atheism. We wish the republic in politics and atheism in religion."⁶ Belfort Bax, Socialism's English "philosopher," says: "Socialism has well been described as a new conception of the world presenting itself . . . in religion as atheistic humanism. . . . The establishment of society on a Socialistic basis implies the definite abandonment of all theological cults."⁷ Enrico Ferri says frankly: "The impairment of the belief in God is one of the most powerful factors in the extension of So-

² *Socialism and Character*, Jos. Leatham, 92.

³ Official Report of Proceedings of 1908 National Convention of Socialist Party (U. S.), pp. 191-205.

⁴ *Volkszeitung*, Sept. 9, 1901.

⁵ *The Call*, March 2, 1911.

⁶ Quoted by Goldstein, *Socialism*, 126.

⁷ *Religion of Socialism*, B. Bax, 81.

cialism.”⁸ Liebknecht puts this thought more forcibly: “It is our duty as Socialists to root out the belief in God with all our zeal,” he is quoted as saying.⁹ La Monte says that “Socialist philosophy proves conclusively that the realization of the ideals of Socialism involves the atrophy of religion.”¹⁰ “This philosophy once accepted,” says Leatham, “the belief in God with all that belief implies, is without a *raison d’être*. There is nothing left for the deity to do.”¹¹

We unhesitatingly subscribe to the conclusions reached by these writers. When the existence of the universe is accounted for by evolution, the idea of God becomes an utter vanity. When the consciousness of men is attributed to their material surroundings, the idea of human free will is seen as a cruel deceit. When “personal immortality has resolved itself into personal evolution,”¹² the thought of life after death becomes an idle dream.

But without the existence of free will in man, or the concept of God, or the hope of eternal life,—what is religion? If religion is not what it is, it may be anything one wishes it to be. If it is not the recognition of some relation between God, the Creator, and man, the creature, a relation involving the responsibility of man and necessitating a free will in him and requiring a future existence for him,—if religion does not predicate these truths, then gravitation, or chemical affinity, or electricity, or motion, or light may be called religion.

⁸ *Socialism and Modern Science*, 63.

⁹ *Social Unrest*, J. G. Brooks.

¹⁰ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 89.

¹¹ Cf. *Socialism*, D. Goldstein, 115.

¹² *Science and Revolution*, Untermann.

Atheism robs religion of all meaning and makes its practice a foolish waste of effort. Socialism being primarily atheistic, is primarily irreligious.

II. HUMANITARIANISM

Socialism is more than mere atheism, it is dialectic materialistic monism. Atheism is the negation of God. Socialism is the negation of God plus the affirmation of creative evolution. The atheist waves God out of the universe and indifferently turns away from the void made. The Socialist peers into the void and discerns the self-created seed of humanity buried some hundred million years back in a self-created protoplasm. The atheist says there is no God because he cannot put his finger on Him. The Socialist says there is no God because there is no need for Him. The attitude of these two toward religion is quite different: the former ignores its meaning; the latter gives it a meaning entirely new.

On its positive side, Socialism is what Bax terms "atheistic humanism." Ladoff calls it "a humanitarian movement — broad as humanity and deep as the mystery of life."¹ Many people regard this as religion. Many believe that in man's humanity to man is embodied all that is essential to religion. Some even who vaguely believe in God, as vaguely believe that "To do unto others as you would have others do unto you" is the purest of religion; the breadth and depth of their religious principle is compassed by the much used phrase, "The universal brotherhood of men."

All such teachings that leave God out of consideration are comprised in the term, humanitarianism. Humanitarianism

¹ *Passing of Capitalism*, 53.

tarianism is not religion. As such it is not even an approach toward religion. Religion is a conscious recognition of the relation of man to his Creator, a recognition that would be required if there were but one man in the world. Humanitarianism is sentiment. It contemplates the natural only, not the supernatural. It sees man only as an animal of high degree, and regards his feelings, emotions, passions, but not his soul made in the image of God. "The brotherhood of men," therefore, in a strictly humanitarian sense, means but little more than a kindly, peaceful, contented, and mutually helpful herd of animals,—a great deal more capable, it is true, but having no greater purpose or destiny. It is only in contemplation of his soul that man is rightly considered as having a destiny higher than a mere animal. "The brotherhood of men," in a sense that postulates the Fatherhood of God, is sentiment flowered into religion, but humanitarianism which ignores God is only sentiment.

This sentiment is exploited by Socialists to a high degree. Notwithstanding the fact that their materialistic philosophy excludes the possibility of a Creator, they declare that the Socialist movement is a religion because it proposes to establish society on a basis where "the sweet spirit of comradeship will blossom forth like the fabled rose of unfading beauty."² "Materialist and scoffer that he is," says one of them, "it is the Socialist's mission to teach truth to the recreant religious organizations."³ "Socialism," says another, "is — not merely ought to be, but is — a religious movement."⁴ Another says: "So-

² *Where We Stand*, J. Spargo, 22.

³ *A Christian View of Socialism*, G. H. Strobell, 30.

⁴ *Socialism and Primitive Christianity*, W. T. Brown, 4.

cialism is a religion. As it gains strength it will become a spiritual passion—not a cry for rights, but a call to righteousness.”⁵ And another: “Socialism is religion in its broadest sense, that is, leaving aside beliefs about God and the immortality of the soul—all matters of a supernatural character . . . Socialism brings religion down from the heaven of clouds to the earth of men.”⁶

Of the simon-pure Socialists who boldly deny God, it must be said that if they believe their teachings to be religious, they have given a new meaning to the term religion. Of those who still cling to a concept of God and yet indulge this belief, it must be said that they do not grasp the old meaning of the word religion. These latter, once identified with the Socialist movement, seldom fail to realize the futility of attempting to reconcile Socialism with religious belief. But almost invariably, when they do realize this, instead of repudiating Socialism, they repudiate religious belief, and in the end develop a hostility toward all religion.

III. HOSTILE ATTITUDE

The thorough-going Socialist is not merely non-religious, he is utterly anti-religious. He antagonizes religion in all its forms. According to his belief, “all religions the world has ever seen have been imposed to prevent the operation of the people’s will;”¹ “The priests of all religions have been throughout all phases of human history the most potent allies of the ruling classes in keep-

⁵ *Why I Am a Socialist*, Geo. D. Herron, 30.

⁶ *Common Sense of Socialism*, J. Spargo, 157; cf. also, *Where We Stand*, loc. cit. supra.

¹ Geo. D. Herron, writing in *The Socialist Spirit*, January, 1903.

ing the masses pliant and submissive under their yoke;”² “Religious rites and ceremonies were instituted to impress on primitive people a respect for private property;”³ “Religion is the expression of those who live off other people and who use it for the purpose of compelling these others to support them;”⁴ “Its function is to chloroform the workers, to make docile wage-slaves of them, patient and contented with their lot in this world while expecting a glorious reward in the next;”⁵ “Religion,—Catholic, Protestant, Methodist, Lutheran, Episcopalian, or any other,—is and has always been a stumbling block and bar to progress and civilization;”⁶ “It is the great engine for enslaving the minds of men, for binding mankind in superstition, ignorance and slavery;”⁷ “It is perhaps the most powerful of the means for maintaining class society by inducing the members of the subject class to act contrary to their own interests and in accordance with that of their masters;”⁸ “All religion is servile, but Christianity is the most servile of the servile;”⁹ “It preaches humility, forbearance, submission, meekness,—all virtues of slavery and of bondage.”¹⁰

Believing thus, Socialists are not true to themselves or to their avowed mission unless they are hostile to religion, and in particular to Christianity, the most perfect religion.

² *Socialism and Modern Science*, Ferri, 63.

³ *Evolution of Private Property*, Paul Lafargue, 58.

⁴ Geo. D. Herron, in *Appeal to Reason*, May 16, 1903.

⁵ *The Social Democrat*, March 15, 1903.

⁶ *Daily People*, June 5, 1903.

⁷ *The Commonwealth*, Vol. 4, No. 137.

⁸ *The People*, Feb. 8, 1900.

⁹ *Philosophical Essays*, J. Dietzgen, 122.

¹⁰ *Passing of Capitalism*, Ladoff, 49.

What are we to think, then, when the Socialists, Victor L. Berger and Winfield R. Gaylord, address an open letter to a distinguished churchman in which they say: "We repeat most emphatically, Socialism advances no teaching 'touching matters of religion'?"¹¹ What of the Socialist platform in which it is declared that Socialism has nothing to do with religion? But whether they believe their teachings against religion true or not, there is purpose in them. "When the heaven above appears as nothing more than a huge falsehood, men will seek to create for themselves a heaven below,"¹² think the Socialists, and truly, and to establish an earthly paradise men may be expected to bend all their energies, stopping for no law, human or divine, respecting no institution, man-made or God-given, that might stand in their way. This will naturally bring them within the Socialist movement, it being the only movement with an aim so pretentious and a disrespect so wanton.

Hence, policy unites with principle to develop in Socialism a hostility toward religious belief and all that such belief implies. "We must wage an unrelenting war against the Church," said the Belgian Socialist Deputy, L. Furnemont; "we must attack her because her economics, her politics, her ethics are contrary to our ideal, because she is the only reactionary force which has any strength and which keeps men in voluntary slavery, so that Christian workingmen have lost all idea of trying to be free."¹³

¹¹ *Social Democrat of Milwaukee*, Oct. 12, 1904.

¹² *Encyclopedia of Social Reforms*, W. P. D. Bliss, 896. Bliss, with Herron and Professor Ely, founded the Christian Socialists, in 1898.

¹³ *Socialist Democrat*, Aug. 15, 1903. One not practiced in the

This rings true with Liebknecht's exhortation to Socialists to root out the faith in God with all their might.

IV. MALICIOUS ATTITUDE

Socialism is not satisfied with its hostile attitude toward religion, it rises to a malicious attitude. As this is the culminating stage of development, there are fewer Socialists who reach it. All out and out Socialists are atheists, but not all are materialists; neither are all materialists hostile to religion, nor yet are all malicious who are hostile. This development is a kind of evolutionary process that brings to the top stage only such persons as are able to overcome the resistance of all anti-Socialist influence and environment, the thorough-going, "scientific" leaders of the movement, who like Ibsen's Nora break completely with the past, "taking nothing and sending back for nothing, not even jewels." Hence, while in the lowest Socialist camps we only find indifference toward religion, and among those straggling in and out of the Socialist lines even reverence for it, in those who occupy the highest places, who stand as the leaders and the teachers of the movement, we find a deep and determined hatred for religion. It is simply a question of the development of the "Socialist mind." Marx, Engels, Dietzgen, Bebel, Blatchford, Bax, Loria, Labriola, Ladoff, Adler, Aveling, Ferri, Herron, Brown, and numbers of others, both living and dead, founders and champions of Scientific Socialism,

gymnastics of Socialist thought would say that a *voluntary* act, even of submission, postulates freedom. One is not free unless free to submit. "Voluntary slavery" conveys about as much meaning as a "round square." It is a fair example of Socialists' "scientific" thought and expression.

are striking examples of this development and of the deep-seated malice toward religion in which it finally culminates. Witness the following excerpts taken at random from the general propaganda:

"Christianity to-day stands for all that is lowest and basest in human life. It is the most degrading of all our institutions and the most brutalizing in its effect on the common life. The subtle methods of the Church in destroying the manhood of the soul are more to be dreaded by the Socialist movement than the world's standing armies."¹ "If ever in the history of the world any institution was finally and completely discredited, it is the religious institution whose putrid and decaying carcass here in the twentieth century menaces the lives of men. . . . It stands before the world as the foe to research, as an enemy of truth and a purveyor of falsehood, an ethically monstrous and morally impotent factor in human society."² "Any church you can name, Protestant, Catholic, orthodox or liberal, means one thing and *only one* — the manufacture of hypocrites."³ "The truth is, we have no such thing as intellectual honesty in the sphere

¹ Geo. D. Herron, writing in *The Worker* for March, 1902. The article of which this extract is the keynote, was considered such a choice Socialist morsel that it was republished by *The Wage Slave*, July, 1908. Herron espoused Socialism while in the Congregationalist ministry, announcing himself as a Christian Socialist, but it was only a short time until he repudiated Christianity.

² Wm. T. Brown, in *The Social Crusader*, July, 1901; republished in *The Advance*. Brown is another ex-minister of a Christian religion who exemplifies the line of development of all those who attempt to harmonize Socialism with religious belief.

³ *Socialism and Primitive Christianity*, Brown, 5.

of religion. We have not even succeeded in getting a conception that has any moral quality.”⁴ “In Christianity we see not only a supporter of the greatest evils, but a *system* that by its fundamental principles vitiates human thought.”⁵ “There is no wrong however terrible which has not been justified by Christianity, no movement for human liberty which has not been opposed by it.”⁶ Blatchford characterizes religion as the “curse of humanity”; Marx, as the “degradation of human nature”; Bebel, as the “sentiment of a heartless world”; Leatham, as the “unthinkable absurdity”; Kautsky, as the “fantasy of weak-minded persons and hypocrites”; Lafargue, as the “nightmare of the human race”; Ladoff, as the “morbid idealization of human wretchedness”; Dietzgen, as the “piteous moan of impotency that stultifies and destroys human society.” Lafargue says that even the savages and barbarians have been corrupted through Christianity’s giving to them “alcoholism, syphilis, and the Bible.”⁷ Bebel declared that Christianity sprang from “the dunghill of social corruption in the Roman Empire.”⁸ Blatchford describes God as a “fickle, jealous, dishonorable, immoral, vindictive, barbarous, cruel, savage, and ignorant monster.”⁹

⁴ *Socialist Spirit*, June, 1902; Brown again.

⁵ Dr. Aveling, paramour of Karl Marx’s daughter, writing in the Socialist magazine *Today*; quoted by Goldstein, *op. cit.*

⁶ John Spargo, in *The Comrade*, May, 1903.

⁷ *Social and Philosophic Studies*, 173.

⁸ *Glossen*, Bebel, 8.

⁹ *God and My Neighbor*, 49. In the preface to this book, the publisher, Chas. H. Kerr, head of the largest Socialist publishing house in the world and himself author of several Socialist works, says: “I recommend this book by Robert Blatchford as

The immeasurable depths of hatred exposed by these blasphemous utterances are so painful to contemplate that one hastens to escape all thought of them. They evince a spirit of diabolical origin, a spirit that revels in belching forth foul epithets against God and religion and in surrounding all things sacred with an atmosphere in which only malice and iniquity are able to thrive.

V. RELIGION AND SOCIALISM CONTRASTED

A distinction made by many Socialists between religion and *creeds* serves their propaganda purposes to advantage. When these Socialists are taxed with their anti-religious utterances, they claim that they do not refer to religion but to creeds. Religion, they say, has been perverted by churchmen and theologians in the interest of the capitalist classes, and it is the perversion in the form of established creeds, and not religion, against which they inveigh. This distinction gives rise to others and occasions several classes of Socialists, each of which attacks religion from a different angle or in a different way. It is beyond the scope of this study to consider these several classes in detail, but on account of them, it seems not ir-

one of the clearest, sanest, most sympathetic and most helpful discussions of the deep and vital problem of religion that it has ever been my good fortune to read." The following extract is a fair sample of the clarity, sanity, sympathy, and helpfulness so highly praised: "I deny the existence of a Heavenly Father, the efficacy of prayer, the providence of God, the truth of the Bible. I do not believe a miracle was ever performed, or that Christ was divine, or that he died for men or ever rose from the dead. I am inclined to believe that he never existed. I do not believe there is a God. I do not believe there is a heaven and I scorn the thought of hell."

relevant to consider the essential religious elements that underlie all creeds and to contrast with these the pertinent elements essential to Socialism as such.

On account of its substance and form, religion properly falls under a threefold division: (1) Natural Religion, (2) Revealed (supernatural) Religion, and (3) Christianity.

1. *Natural Religion.*

In its most primitive concept, religion is the recognition of a being superior to and supreme over man. This idea comes to man with the dawn of reason. All men possess it. A classic phrase of Plutarch reads: "If we travel over the world, we may find cities without walls, without theatres or schools, without art or science, but a city without a temple no man ever saw. We may find tribes without cities, but there never existed a tribe without some form of religion." In this primitive idea are rooted all forms of worship, the true as well as the false, its right development being true religion and its wrong development being false, the primitive concept being the same,— a supreme, omniscient being who is the author of man's being and the arbiter of his destiny. In no sense can religion be predicated of a worship or a teaching that is not rooted in the concept of such a being. When any human aspiration transcends the sphere of humanity, if it reaches toward God, it is religion. When sentiment is limited to humanity, or human impulse aspires no higher than humanity, there is not religion.

Socialism rests its foundation and its hope in humanity alone. It makes no pretense of lifting man above his environment or above himself; hence, it is not in any sense a supernatural aspiration and it can no more be

called a religion than can politics. Socialism is sentiment.¹

2. *Revealed Religion.*

God is infinite. Man is finite. Only the simplest aspect of the relation between them can be grasped by man's unaided reason. Natural religion, therefore, is crude and imperfect: to raise it toward perfection, revelation from God is required, not to correct reason, but to complement it. Revelation is the refining principle at the bottom of religious development. It comes from God Who is infinitely perfect; and by virtue of it the growth of religion is constantly toward perfection. Thus man, his shortcomings being supplemented, his weaknesses being supported, his unreasoned errors being corrected,— is lifted by revelation above himself,— is drawn from the midst of his imperfections toward a perfect state that corresponds not to man's idea but to the idea of God Who is infinite perfection. Revelation opens up to man a new field of knowledge, new obligations and a new destiny. It introduces to him the supernatural world and explains to him how he will actually inhabit that world and how his place there will be secured and fixed.

If Socialism is not an approach toward natural religion it is still less an approach toward revealed religion. If it is not acceptable as a substitute for the crude religious

¹ *The Superstition Called Socialism*, is the title of a book by G. B. DeTunzlemann, but in a sense this is a misnomer. Superstition is the blind groping of ignorant man for something by which to escape his environment, the religious impulse directed toward something other than God. It is a kind of false religion. The term is not applicable to Socialism except to characterize its blind, unreasoned teaching.

belief that springs from human reason, it is far less acceptable as a substitute for that belief which is rooted in the truths that God has revealed. Socialism is subject to all of the imperfections of mankind and it has nothing to counteract them or to free mankind from them. It is compassed on all sides by erring human nature, by its faults, its frailties, its passions, its wrong-doings, and it points to nothing beyond human nature by which these can be corrected. Socialism cannot ennoble or lift up humanity. It cannot elevate or inspire. It cannot refine or purify. It is chained by the iron chain of materialism to the pillar of its own limitations.

3. *Christianity.*

The perfection of God's revelation to man, with its unsearchable mysteries, its incomprehensible love, its eternal promises, is summed up in the word Christianity, which is belief in Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Christianity is the perfect religion. Christ is the perfect revelation. He is the *Word made flesh*. Through the Incarnation of His divine Son, the revelation of God to man culminates in the mystical union of God *with* man. That union confers upon mankind a dignity that is incomprehensible, a blessing that is immeasurable. Christianity is the magic crucible that turns into gold the pain and suffering of the human race,—the sorrowful are comforted, the lowly are ennobled, the humble are exalted, the poor are enriched, the helpless, afflicted, and infirm are lifted up and supported. It is a transcendent brotherhood, born of the ineffable Fatherhood, which links all men of clean heart to one another and to God, and by a diffusion of divine grace that makes all things equal in the end it makes up for the natural differences among

human beings, equalizes inequalities, and brings to a balance the privileges and the privations in human life. Christianity is the most sublime and efficacious scheme for the justification and final happiness of mankind that it is given the human intellect to conceive. Indeed, in the first instance only God could conceive this scheme so divinely adapted to the fulfilment of the inspirations and the hopes that mark the noble impulses of the human soul.

The contrast of Socialism with Christianity is painfully striking. In place of the Immanent God, it substitutes matter, and in place of the Son of God, a development of matter. For the blessing of divine grace it gives us "bread alone"; and for the human soul, animal instincts. Christianity springs from four main angles, the immortality of the soul, the Fall of man, the divinity of Christ and the Atonement. Socialism springs from a point, the seat of the world of sensuality,—man's belly, to which, as though to a god, it refers "all things under the sun." Christianity is love. By virtue of the love they inspire, the teachings of Christ have overcome the world,—passion has been subdued, appetite dulled, suffering ennobled and privation blest. "There are Faith, Hope, and Love, but the greatest of these is Love." Socialism is hatred. Hatred is engendered by its doctrines; it is the strength of the Socialist movement, which grows with each base passion it touches, gains impetus with each lawless impulse it feels, and sweeps blindly on toward the destruction of civilization.

But perhaps the most marked contrast readily seen between Socialism and Christianity appears in their respective aims. The aim of Christianity is to attain Heaven, and the way to this glorious destiny is "The

Royal Road of the Cross." "First the Cross and then the Crown," lays the priest-bard of the Southland as he touches the two notes that sound the Christian Chord, — sacrifice and reward. Love means sacrifice; and sacrifice means reward. Heaven is the reward of him who loves and is willing to suffer, of him who in love acknowledges the Fatherhood of God and who in privation and sacrifice strives through Christ to bring about the brotherhood of man. The aim of Socialism is not to attain Heaven but to set up a heaven of its own. Not admitting a life hereafter, it demands a paradise here. It hopes to attain this aim through "the solidarity of the human race," that is, the realization of a state of society where the individual member will be absorbed by the social "organism," where the human soul will "speedily depersonalize itself, in will, habit and desire, of its phantom personality for the truer, larger personality of society." Science has turned the world into a neighborhood; Socialism will turn it into a brotherhood; and there will be nothing to hinder the development of the "social organism" to such a degree of perfection that the "individual is altogether banished from life, and things which are by nature private, such as eyes and ears and hands, have become common, and all men express praise and blame, and feel joy and sorrow, on the same occasions."

Contrasting the practical effects of Christianity and Socialism on human action, we find that while the former supplies an efficient motive for initiative, the latter is wholly inadequate in this respect. Man is a self-conscious being. He submits or acts only when prompted by sufficient motives of self-interest, real or apparent, immediate or remote. The Christian is furnished with a powerful

motive for submission or action, even though they may mean suffering and sacrifice for the time. He hopes ultimately to attain to the perfect and eternal happiness of Heaven, not for others, but for himself, and on this account he is willing to undergo all privation, bear all burdens, suffer all pains, uncomplainingly, to undertake the most painful and humiliating duty or make the most costly and consummate sacrifice, voluntarily. For Heaven is his goal, and the happiness of Heaven no "eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to know." Socialism can hold out no hope so inspiring. It is buried beneath the mountain of human infirmities, and for suffering and sacrifice it can offer no reward that is not freighted with infirmity. It demands of the individual deliberate self-effacement at which normal self-consciousness rebels. The sacrifice of the Christian is for a time only, therefore it is both voluntary and real. But the sacrifice of a Socialist must be forever, therefore it must be enforced or can only be pretended. Christianity infuses into the hearts of men the fire of hope; Socialism strikes into their hearts the iron of despair. Adhering to the teachings of Christianity men become devoted, loyal, patient, good; following the teachings of Socialism they become desperate.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MORAL PRINCIPLE

I. MORALS DISTINGUISHED FROM ETHICS

With respect to morals, Socialism is marked by its lack of principle. This defect follows from the absence of a religious principle in Socialism. For morals depends on religion in the same manner that religion depends on God. In many particulars morals and religion are indistinguishable, and in no particular are they more widely separated than practice is separated from belief. Socialism has an ethical principle, but not a moral. The too common error of confusing morals with ethics should be avoided from the outset. Primarily, morals refers to right relations between God and man; ethics, to right relations between man and man; hence, morals is closely allied with religious belief, while ethics is limited to social life. In practice, this distinction is not so perceptible. Just as a given belief may embody both a divine and a social element, so a given act may have both a moral and an ethical aspect. This brings about a confusion of terms that results in many errors. Such confusion is quite prevalent among Socialists, and as a consequence, notwithstanding Socialism essentially excludes a moral principle, Socialists are heard on every hand to say that it embodies the only perfect moral system that has ever been proposed to the world. This claim must be rejected

point blank. Being devoid of religious principle, Socialism cannot embody a moral principle. Under conceivable, though impossible, conditions its ethics might be desirable, but never moral. God is wanting, and without God there is no moral basis.

II. FREE WILL A CONDITION OF MORALITY

It must be said further that Socialism is essentially non-moral, not only because it substitutes ethics for morals, but because it denies the existence of human free will which is a necessary condition of human accountability. To hold one accountable and yet not free, or to declare one free and yet not accountable, does violence to every man's sense of justice. "Thou Shalt," and "Thou Shalt Not," are the two phrases that sum up the burden of all law, human and divine, and they postulate in man a freedom of choice. It goes with the saying that an indispensable condition of moral action is free will.

Another distinction is properly made here. Morality is not the same as goodness. The difference lies in just this particular of free will. Goodness is the quality of being adapted to *the* end. A machine is good if it does the work it was made to do. Poison is good if it is deadly, and though by chance it kills a man, it is good poison. When God created the world, "He saw that it was good." But morality is more than goodness. It is the goodness of a self-conscious *free* agent. It is the self-conscious and self-willed adaptation of a free being to *the* end for which he was made.

The philosophy of Socialism, in its basic principle (materialism) as well as in its structural outline (economic determinism), stands in unalterable opposition to even the

possible existence of self-consciousness and free will. It thus uproots the only conceivable norm of human accountability. It will not prove amiss to consider in this connection the views of some leading Socialists on the question. In a little book ¹ that was hailed by the *Chicago Daily Socialist* (5/4-1909) as "the very best general statement of the up-to-date Socialist position that is in existence," Kark Kautsky treats the question of free will at length and explains in the following terse language why Socialism and free will must be held incompatible: "If the will is free and can shape things as it wishes, then it can also shape the direction of economic development. Then it is impossible to discover any guarantee that we are growing into Socialism. It is impossible to determine any kind of historical development whatever, and no scientific knowledge of society is possible." In another of his writings, Kautsky for a moment all but admits the existence of free will. "For action," he says, "the feeling of freedom is an indispensable psychological necessity." ² This is only a *feeling*, however, not an actuality, he tells us. Subjectively, according to this eminent Socialist philosopher, man feels that he is free as to the future, but when the future is past, he knows he was not free. And even this unreal psychological feeling "is no monopoly of man, but holds also of all other animals, who have freedom of the will in the same sense that man has, namely, as a subjective feeling." Another Socialist says: "The

¹ *Road to Power*, by Kautsky, said in the appreciation mentioned to be "recognized as the foremost living Marxian scholar."

² *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, Kautsky, 59; cf. also, *Philosophical Essays*, Dietzgen, 164, and Isadore Ladoff, in *International Socialist Review*, June, 1908, 740.

will does not choose of itself, as was supposed by the inventors of FREE WILL, that product of the impotency of psychological analysis not arrived at maturity. Volitions are the result, first, of necessity, and then of all that precedes them up to the very elementary organic impulses."³ "If our heredity and our environment be good," says another, "we must act well, we cannot help it. If they be bad we must act ill, we cannot help it."⁴ La Monte says: "The Marxist absolutely denies the freedom of the will. Every human act is inevitable."⁵ The consequence of this fatalism is frankly accepted by Spargo, who, in discussing the evolution of economic conditions in its relation to the class struggle and its attendant wrongs, says: "It follows that individuals are not responsible."⁶

III. END OF MAN THE BASIS OF MORALITY

In order correctly to appraise the moral goodness of human action, it is necessary, in addition to postulating free will, to have a correct idea of the end or the purpose of human existence. All are not agreed as to the real purpose of man's existence, but of the many views on this question, it is pertinent to consider only two here: that of the Socialist and that of the (Christian) theist. It might seem that only the Socialist concept is pertinent, and this would be true if that were the true concept. The Socialist concept is the only erroneous concept that is pertinent. The true concept is pertinent to define the error

³ *Materialistic Conception of History*, Labriola, 115.

⁴ *Not Guilty* (a novel), Robert Blatchford, 193.

⁵ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, LaMonte, 65.

⁶ *The Socialists*, John Spargo, 60.

of that not true. For error is judged by truth, not truth by error. Truth is not held to be true because it differs from error, but error is declared to be false because it differs from truth. All truths coincide and fit perfectly while error jars with the universe. The jarring note does not apprise us of truth, but of error. If the general harmony is not kept fixed resounding in the mind, the discordant note may not strike harshly on the ear and will not be so readily detected. Therefore, in order not to be deceived by a statement of the Socialist concept, we should first consider the true concept of the end of man.

Man is made to love and serve God in this world and to be forever happy with Him in the world to come. Love and service of God denotes willing acceptance of His acts, obedience to His laws, submission to His will. It means recognition and consideration for God and the whole of His creation, for mankind in particular, since man is the highest and noblest of earthly beings. There is no call here for proofs that this is the true conception of man's end. Proofs are on record in a multitude of forms. It is Socialism that is before the bar of reason now; theism has stood trial, is in possession, and its case is closed for all who are not intellectual anarchists until refutations not in the record have been established.

The Socialist conception of the end of man is that he is made to serve society. Society is the supreme being of Socialism. In fact, Socialism claims that society made man, gave him consciousness and on this basis built up the social structure with its appointments, religion, politics, jurisprudence, etc. Accordingly, man's end is attained when his life conforms to the social life, when his interests

merge with the social interests, when his will is identified with the social will; in fine, when his whole existence is absorbed in the existence of society. Society, as here predicated, means not one's friends and neighbors, not one's fellowmen individually, but the "organism" called society; that is, society as a being whose parts or members are dependent upon it for their existence and their welfare similarly to the manner in which the arm is dependent upon the human body or human organism.

There is a seeming parallel between these two concepts in respect to social relations. But it is only seeming. Social relations are involved in the theistic concept, but not essentially so. This concept would hold good if there existed but one man in the universe,— he would owe love and service to God who created him. But since social relations exist, they, too, must be conformed to man's true end. Hence the commands, not to kill, not to steal, not to covet, not to bear false witness, and, to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick, bury the dead,— flow naturally from and are obligatory in the theistic concept. Hence also, what are termed natural rights — life, liberty, property, the pursuit of happiness, which hold good as against society and of which no innocent person can be justly deprived on any account. On the other hand, the Socialist concept holds social relations to be in themselves the end of man, so that on the hypothesis that only one man existed there would be no purpose for his existence. It recognizes no right, not even the right to life, to be superior to the claim of society. Society might with impunity, nay, it is required to cut off all useless and especially harmful members. Just as amputation of an injurious or useless member of the body is necessary for

the welfare of the human organism, so the removal of all injurious or useless members of society is necessary for the welfare of the social "organism." Hence, the direct contrary of the theistic commands may be required by the Socialist concept, and indeed, must be when it is put into effect; *e.g.*, the crippled, the old, the infirm,—all who, whether in mind or body, are not a help but a hindrance to society,—would be at the mercy of any member of society who discovered that they were a drawback; property in the hands of persons who would not make the most of it for the social welfare would be taken from them by those who would; the wife of one not perfectly fitted to produce to the best advantage of society would be claimed by one better fitted, etc. It is clear that there is not and cannot be anything in common between these two concepts of the end of man.

The conclusions reached from the premises are unavoidable: First, because it excludes all relations higher than social relations, which call not for morals but for ethics, Socialism is at best non-moral; next, because it denies the existence of human free will, it is also non-ethical; finally, because it holds a false conception of the end of man, it is positively opposed to all true good.

IV. SOCIALIST CONCEPTION OF MORALITY

Still, it is claimed that Socialism teaches the highest morality; that, while Socialists "have no respect for current morality, it is none the less true that they have a growing morality of their own—a morality that has already emerged from the embryonic stage."¹ It is,

¹ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, LaMonte, 63.

therefore, proper that consideration be given to the Socialist concept of morality, although in view of what we have seen it is not strictly necessary. The preceding suggestions will facilitate a more ready understanding of the character and import of this concept as it is variously defined by representative Socialists, and it is with this object that a review of their expressions has been so far deferred. And now, only a cursory review of them may be undertaken. There are but few Socialists who have written anything who have not expressed their views on this subject and to bring them together here would make this part of our study exceed all reasonable limits. However, there is an unusual unanimity of opinion among Socialists on this matter. With the exception of the self-styled Christian Socialists, who are of small consequence in the Socialist movement, the Socialists of all countries, with substantial uniformity in thought and with very little variety in language, have endorsed the moral concept expressed thus by Spargo: "Whatever advances the interests of society is right; whatever militates against those interests is wrong. We bring heaven back from the clouds of mythology to the earth of men. A thing is right or wrong not by reason of one God or many gods or the prophets of gods, but according as it affects the society in which we live. We do not ask Moses, or Christ, or Mohammed, or Confucius, Mrs. Eddy, John Wesley or the Pope, is this right? but we ask how will it affect the class to which I belong";²—or by Ladoff: "Morality or ethics is a system of conduct of the members of a social group. Their conduct is regulated or controlled by the group in its collective interests.

² *Where We Stand*, J. Spargo, 19.

Acts injurious to the interests of the group are condemned as immoral and acts useful to the interests of the group are praised as moral";³—or by Hillquit: "Morality, in a more advanced society comes to a large extent to signify conduct favoring the economic efficacy and prosperity of the nation";⁴—or by May Wood Simon: "In each and every stage of society the test of any system of ethics lies in the proof that it does or does not make for the progress of the race. By progress here is meant an increasing control by man over the forces of nature";⁵—or by Chas. H. Kerr: "In this throbbing life in which we work, what is the moral, the right thing for us to do, for us who hear the groans of slavery and who see the light of freedom just ahead? If we accept the moral standards that we find around us we are riveting our own fetters. Let us then reject them once for all. In the better social order which is coming that action will be right which is for the good of all";⁶—or by John Burrowes: "So you have no word at all in your philosophy for the conduct and the beautifying of the private (individual) soul? Hardly a word, sir, save one of advice to depersonalize itself speedily of its phantom personality and get into the truer, larger personality of society."⁷

As to natural rights, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the following are expressive of the Socialist

³ *International Socialist Review*, February, 1905, 449.

⁴ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, 59.

⁵ *International Socialist Review*, December, 1900, 336.

⁶ *Morals and Socialism*, 17.

⁷ *International Socialist Review*, January, 1902, 489.

It will be observed that all of these authorities are American Socialists, which is remarked because tacticians often try to shift unwelcome criticism against foreign Socialists.

attitude: "It must be confessed that the revolutionary worker has absolutely no respect for natural rights — including the right of property."⁸ "The theory of natural rights is a figment of the immature capitalist brain. All thoughtful persons know that there are no natural rights, that the phrase 'natural rights' is a contradiction in terms."⁹ "The doctrine of natural rights is one that probably more than any other distinguishes the old metaphysical school of political economy. It is a fallacy that is refuted by all the teachings of history, and no person with any valid claim to a knowledge of Socialism would teach it."¹⁰

The Socialist concept of morality is so extraordinary, and to understand it is so essential to a proper appraisal of the Socialist movement, that we feel impelled to extend the line of authorities expressing the Socialist view.

"It must never be forgotten that ideas of right and wrong are not absolute but relative, not fixed but fluid, changing with the changes in our mode of production. Morality varies not only with time but with social attitude. Ethics simply registers the degrees by which the ruling class stamps with approval or brands with censure the effect of human conduct upon the welfare of that class. Morality is in its very essence a class institution — a set of rules of conduct enforced or inculcated for the benefit of a class."¹¹ "Each social stage of development has its own condition of production and each like-

⁸ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, LaMonte, 64.

⁹ *The Call*, March 15, 1909.

¹⁰ *The Chicago Socialist*, July 11, 1903.

¹¹ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 59.

wise has its own code of morals, which is but the reflection of the social conditions. That is moral which is usage.”¹² “Standards of moral value which served very well in the past are valueless and vicious now. Moralities of yesterday are immoral to-day and destructive of the liberty and integrity of the soul.”¹³ “There has never yet been a permanent or a universal code of morals. Like every other social institution, it has been a product of the changes in material surroundings, geographical locations and different methods of gaining a livelihood.”¹⁴ “There *can* be no eternal ethical or moral code. The material interests of the ruling class of every age are reflected in their moral code, and this code will be changed, modified and adapted to suit the character of production, even though the change be so rapid as to reverse in a single year the code of the previous year.”¹⁵ “The prevailing moral system, in common with all social institutions, has its foundations in the economic conditions and relations of men in society. The one hope of the world is in the victory of the proletariat, but this victory can only be won by a proletariat permeated with the sense of solidarity; and the workingman, imbued with this sense of proletarian solidarity, will be a living incarnation of the new morality. As fast as they become class-conscious they will recognize and praise as moral all conduct that tends to hasten the revolution — the triumph of their class, and they will unhesitatingly condemn as immoral all conduct that tends to prolong the dominance

¹² *Woman*, Bebel, 16.

¹³ Herron, *International Socialist Review*, January, 1901, 434.

¹⁴ May Wood Simons, *Id.*, December, 1900, 337.

¹⁵ J. Oneal, *The Worker*, Dec. 2, 1905.

of the capitalist class.”¹⁶ “Social morality, the responsibility of man to the life of man, will take the place of theological morality, the responsibility of man to some abstract idea.”¹⁷

“In earlier stages of society, morality affirmed itself as the solidarity of the individual with his kin, his gens, his tribe, his people. The interest of the individual was absolutely identified with that of the race. His personal *telos* was identified with the social whole into which he entered. At the same time that he had no interest independent of the race, he had no duties outside that race. . . . The individual is sunk in the society, knows and cares for no existence outside of society. This is from the Socialist point of view the highest morality which up to now has been generally prevalent in the world.”¹⁸ “The principle of morality is the principle of human association and the principle of human association is progress. Social Democracy is nothing else and desires nothing else, but social and co-operative progress and that is the true moral perfection.”¹⁹ “In Socialism ethics become politics and politics become ethical, while religion means the higher and more far-reaching aspect of that ethical sense of obligation, duty, fraternity, which is the ultimate bond of every-day society.”²⁰ “The morality of the final organization simply consists in acts and abstention from acts that make for social cohesion.”²¹

¹⁶ *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 64.

¹⁷ *Useful Work vs. Useless Toil*, Wm. Morris, 20.

¹⁸ *Ethics of Socialism*, Belfort Bax, 9; cf. also 26.

¹⁹ *Philosophic Essays*, J. Dietzgen, 166.

²⁰ *Ethics*, Bax, 29.

²¹ *Economic Foundations of Society*, Loria, 13.

“ Only the lack of social impulses and virtues which man has inherited from the social animals, is to be regarded as absolute immorality.” ²²

It is believed that the foregoing excerpts from the writers and teachers who mold the Socialist movement fairly express the Socialist concept of morality. We shall not attempt a refutation of the views expressed. If we bar from consideration the simpler commands of God, the good or bad character of a given human act becomes a matter too complicated for our comprehension. It involves a knowledge and consideration of all truth and all science, and we are unable to lay claim to such great learning. If only that be good which will advance the interests of the social group to which we belong, then to determine the good in a given action no fact, past, present or future, that is related to that action, may be left out of consideration, for that very fact might on the instant be more important than all those considered. Under such a supposition, good or bad conduct is absolutely undeterminable. Having made this supposition a real condition for themselves by excluding the All-Knowing God, it is no surprise that Socialist philosophers, overwhelmed by the difficulty of their situation, have cut the Gordian knot by disclaiming for man the faculty of free choice. If there were no God, one can imagine no curse that would so completely blast man's happiness as the faculty and consequently the duty of free choice where the knowledge of a God were necessary to choose aright. In his *Notes on Ingersoll*, the late Rev. L. A. Lambert makes some suggestions that are valuable in this connec-

²² *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, Kautsky, 92.

tion. The moral concept announced by Ingersoll is so similar to that of Socialists and Dr. Lambert's "Comment" is a refutation so complete as to both that we quote at length.

"Ingersoll: Everything is right that tends to the happiness of mankind. And everything is wrong that increases the sum of human misery. If the consequences are good, so is the action.

"Comment: The assassin of Garfield justified his act on this very principle. His last words on the scaffold were, 'Only good can come of it.' According to this standard the quality of a human act cannot be determined until all of its consequences are known. But the full consequences of no act can be known by man, for the consequences of an act become in their turn the causes of other acts whose consequences are the causes of still other acts, and thus on indefinitely. To determine the quality of an act one must know whether the sum of all these consequences is good or bad; or, if any *one* consequence can indicate the nature of the act, it is necessary to know which of this limitless multitude does so. Now, no man can know this, and hence, no man can know the nature of any given act. Your standard, then, affords man no practical information. It is, therefore, utterly worthless. . . . Are you not afraid that your philosophy may put a bee into the head of some religious fanatic, who, misled by your teaching, might consider his killing of you a virtuous and holy act, foolishly imagining that the result of it might prove beneficial to society and religion? I, as a Christian, condemn that act beforehand as a crime; but you cannot, because according to your theory the act cannot be said to be evil until its consequences are known. As the conse-

quences of your death cannot be known, it follows that your murder might be a good or bad act. The Christian holds not only that murder is a crime, but that even the intention, determination or resolve, though unexecuted, is a crime deserving of hell. Thus the Christian religion strikes at the root of this murderous propensity, and kills the dragon before he issues from his den in the secret heart. The doctrine that acts take their nature from their result is a necessary consequence of the denial of God. It destroys individual responsibility and is subversive of all government and social order. It denies all appeal to right and destroys not only justice but the idea of justice." ²³

V. THE MORAL LAW OF SOCIALISM

The foregoing considerations lead up to the questions: Whence comes the moral law? What are its commands? Having a moral concept, Socialists thereby admit the existence of a moral law and it is well to inquire into the source from which this law springs and the character it assumes. It does not come from God, for Socialists deny God; nor from civil authority, for they hold that to be constitutionally immoral. It does not come from man's consciousness, for they hold consciousness to be the product of environment, and in part itself the moral law.

Dietzgen says: "No divine oracle; no inner voice or deduction from the brain shall teach us moral truth." ¹ Labriola: "Ethics does not place itself nor does it engender itself. There is no such a universal foundation of ethical relations as that spiritual entity which has been

²³ *Notes on Ingersoll*, Chap. XXI.

¹ *Philosophical Essays*, 150.

called the moral conscience. This abstract entity has been eliminated by criticism." ² Kautsky: "Not from our organs of knowledge comes the moral law and the moral judgment; there need not be bound up the higher faculty of intelligence." ³

Whence, then, the moral law? ^{3a}

Hillquit says: "The moral sense is a product of the processes of evolution of man, gained in his struggle for existence precisely in the same manner as his intellectual faculties." ⁴ Untermann says: "The social relations of man are subordinate to the infinite interdependence of every atom in the world process and we need no ethical code for the understanding of this process." ⁵ Dietzgen says: "Morality is based on the general social need. With the growth of that need morality grows. We find the fact undeniable that with the growth of productive forces the social instinct grows, human association becomes broader and deeper, morality becomes more moral." ⁶ Chas. K. Franklin says: "I conceive the universe to be a process in the adjustment and readjustment of the forms of energy constituting nature, and the process is accomplished by the expenditure in different methods of these two forms of energy along the line of least resistance. First, as in the line of physical nature, where the line of least resistance is determined by the blind

² *Essays on Materialistic Conception of History*, 207.

³ *Ethics*, 90.

^{3a} Kautsky says the "moral law" and the "moral judgment" come "from our impulses." *Ethics*, 90.

⁴ *Socialism, Theory and Practice*, 50.

⁵ *International Socialist Review*, August, 1904.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 150.

conflict of contending forces. Second, as in organic matter, where the line of least resistance is determined by mind. Third, as in morality, where the line of least resistance is determined by the moral sense.”⁷

And of this moral law,—which is no more than the adjustment and readjustment of the forces of energy, which depends on the interdependence of material atoms, which grows and expands with social impulses along the line of least resistance,—what are its commands? We may accept the answer Dietzgen made to this question as an orthodox answer, not only because it is accepted by Socialists, but also because it is consistent with Socialist fundamentals: “The moral world has but one command: permanent social progress, limitless social evolution.”⁸ “Therefore, what Socialists must teach is not abstract ethical formulæ. What is needed, and sufficient, and *alone ethical* (sic), because alone vital and effective, is an understanding of the irresistible process of universal evolution.”⁹

It seems, therefore, to be much like chasing a rainbow to undertake to search out the Socialist commands relating to moral conduct. Where there is no other command than “limitless social evolution,” no other need than an understanding of “universal evolution,”—no more definite obligation—unless we accept the statement of Kautsky that “an animal impulse and nothing else is the moral law”—the poor man who is not gifted with the scientific insight, foresight and hindsight bestowed on

⁷ Socialization of Humanity, *International Socialist Review*, November, 1904.

⁸ *Philosophical Essays*, 171.

⁹ *International Socialist Review*, E. Untermann, August, 1904.

Socialist philosophers must be content to learn what the Socialist moral does not command.

It does not command one to worship God, but instead suggests that one worship "the laws and forces of nature."¹⁰ It does not command one to reverence the name of God, but says: "There is no name — care not what it is — that has any sacredness."¹¹ It does not command one to love God, and even to talk about Him is resented as a "gratuitous insult." Ask a Scientific Socialist if it is immoral to steal, and he will say that he "has no respect for property rights nor the least scruple about violating them."¹² He will try to heap confusion upon us by affirming in all seriousness that "the time will come when no one will be able to speak about the rights of property without covering himself with ridicule and putting himself voluntarily into an inferior rank."¹³ Ask him if it is immoral to commit murder and he will say that he calls the assassins of Russia his "comrades and so do all the Socialists of America and all the Socialists of the world,"¹⁴ that he will unhesitatingly "use *any* weapon that will win his fight."¹⁵ He will even go so far as to say that "if a tramp should meet a child on the highway, murder her, rob her of a few coppers and throw her body into a ditch — he ought not to be punished."¹⁶ Ask him if it is immoral to commit adultery, and he will answer

¹⁰ *Economic Interpretation of History*, L. Parce, 61.

¹¹ *Socialism and Primitive Christianity*, W. T. Brown, 19.

¹² Debs, *International Socialist Review*, January, 1912.

¹³ *Studies in Socialism*, Juarès, 32.

¹⁴ London's Yale Address, 1906.

¹⁵ *Industrial Socialism*, 57.

¹⁶ *Not Guilty*, a novel by Robt. Blatchford, 203.

that all such matters "are merely a private affair, subject to no law, human or divine,"¹⁷ that "when property is transformed, boys and girls may freely listen to the promptings of their nature,"¹⁸ that then "free sexual intercourse can be the highly moral product of a healthy social organism."¹⁹

Socialism does not teach humility, patience, meekness, but holds these to be "virtues of slavery and of bondage."²⁰ It does not teach even the ordinary virtues of sobriety, industry, thrift; for all such virtues, it claims, "simply enrich the idle and wicked and reduce the industrious and righteous to slavery. Teetotalism will not do, increased skill will not do, saving will not do. Nothing *will* do but Socialism."²¹ We shall close this section with a clever bit of verse from the pen of LaMonte,²² wherein this popular Socialist propagandist epitomizes and illumines the philosophy and the law of Socialist morality:

"What are 'wrong,' 'right,' 'vice,' 'virtue,' 'bad' and 'good'?"

Mere whips to scourge the backs that naked bear
The burden of the world — bent backs that dare
Not rise erect, defy the tyrant 'should,'
And freely, boldly do the things they would.
In living's joy they rarely have a share;

¹⁷ *Woman*, August Bebel, 466.

¹⁸ Quoted by Lecky from G. Deville, *Democracy and Liberty*, ii, 348.

¹⁹ *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, Kautsky.

²⁰ *Passing of Capitalism*, Isadore Ladoff, 49.

²¹ *Imprudent Marriages*, Blatchford, 4; cf. also, Paul Lafargue's *Right to be Lazy*.

²² *Socialism Positive and Negative*, 57.

They look beyond the grave and hope that there
They'll be repaid, poor fools, for being good.
To serve thy master, that is virtue, Slave;
To do thy will, enjoy sweet life, is vice.
Poor duty-ridden serf, *rebel!* Forget
Thy master-taught morality. Be brave
Enough to make this earth a Paradise
Whereon the Sun of Joy will never set."

CHAPTER FIVE

THE POLITICAL PRINCIPLE

I. CIVIL AUTHORITY

Politics has been defined as the science of civil government. Government is based upon authority. A political principle, therefore, must define the source and character of civil authority. All teachings bearing on this question are reducible to three concepts. The first of these to be considered, because that most consonant with human reason, is that which holds that all authority comes from God. "There is no authority but from God," declare the scriptures, and hence, "The powers that be are ordained of God." This truth lies at the root of all governments that have been lawfully constituted from the beginning. When God gave to the first man "dominion over every living creature that moveth upon the earth," He stamped civil authority with a source and character that are divine. This concept should not be confused with its abusive application, which, beginning with the resistance offered by tyrannical princes to the authority of Popes exercised on behalf of oppressed subjects, in time gave rise to the doctrine of the divine right of kings.

NOTE: To say that the authority of the Popes was exercised in behalf of the oppressed may excite surprise in those who are accustomed to regard the Catholic Church as itself an instrument of oppression. But the statement is more than

warranted. The historian Lecky, a free-thinker, says (*History of Rationalism in Europe*, ii, 17): "The Church, which seemed so haughty and overbearing in its dealings with kings and princes and nobles, never failed to listen to the poor and the oppressed, and for many centuries their protection was the foremost of all the objects of her policy." Draper, the Protestant historian, says (*The European Age of Faith*): "From her central seat in Rome, her all-seeing eye, like that of Providence itself, at a glance could equally take in a hemisphere or examine the private life of an individual. Her boundless influences enveloped kings in their palaces and relieved the beggar at the monastery gate. In all Europe there was not a man too obscure, too insignificant or too desolate for her. In ages of lawlessness and rapine, among people but a step above savages, she vindicated the inviolability of her precincts against the hand of power and made her temples a refuge and a sanctuary for the despairing and the oppressed. Truly, she was the shadow of a great rock in many a weary land!" Even the Socialist historian, H. M. Hyndman, has a tribute to pay her. He says (*Historical Basis of Socialism*, 15): "The Church, as all know, was the one body in which equality of conditions was the rule from the start; there at least, the man of ability, who outside her pale was forced to bow down before some baron, could rise to a position in which the unlettered swashbuckler grovelled before him. Sixtus V was picked out of the gutter; our Englishman, Adrian IV, was a poor laborer's son; and these are but two instances out of thousands. Also, however dangerous the spiritual authority of the Church may appear to us, it was used for the most part, for the people and against the dominant class, and its influence, as history shows, was almost unbounded."

It is the authority that is from God, not the power to exercise that authority, which is as distinct from authority

as is an officer from the office he holds. This idea and distinction is found clearly expressed by Suarez, who says: "By the mere fact of men being gathered together into the body of one State or commonwealth, civil authority results in that community without the intervention of any created will, and that with so great necessity that the result cannot be hindered by any human will — which is a clear proof that the authority is immediately of God (since all things that follow immediately upon human nature are immediately of God, the Author of that nature). But evidently this authority is not in one person, nor in any special company of persons, because by the nature of the thing it is only in the commonwealth, because by dint of natural reasoning no reason can be devised why this authority should be determined to one person, or to a fixed number of persons short of the whole community, rather than to any other person or to any other number; therefore, in virtue to nature's grant it is immediately in the commonwealth only."¹

The second concept to be considered arose from the failure among rulers to observe the distinction so clearly made by this eminent writer. The "divine right" doctrine that sprang up as a consequence of this failure, when pressed to its logical conclusion, appeared an error, and in rejecting it, many rejected the truth of which it was a corruption. Hence, came about the idea that civil authority is derived from the governed, which was taught by Hobbes (*Leviathan*), Locke (*Civil Government*), Rousseau (*The Social Contract*) and others who imbibed the poisonous principles of the French Encyclopedists.

¹ *Defensio Fidei*, III, c. ii.

It is sometimes said that this idea is embodied in the American Declaration of Independence in the statement that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," but, although largely inspired by the writings of Rousseau and other French doctrinaires, this does not in terms coincide with their view since it specifies "power" and not authority as coming from the people governed, which is not error.

This second concept being untrue, it proved inadequate, and the more thoroughly it was put into effect, the more manifest became its inefficacy. This gave rise to a third concept, which is that of Socialism. This concept holds that civil authority is not from God, because there is no God. It holds that it is not from men, for the consciousness of men, instead of determining their social life, is itself determined by it. According to this concept, authority is no more or less than evolutionary force. Each stage in the development of this force produces certain material conditions. The sum of these conditions at a given time constitutes all that is implied in the terms, authority, government, State, law. The conditions that are summed up in the particular phase called social life, constitute the authority in or over that life, or, civil authority. In this view, society may be likened to a collection of material particles that are drawn together and formed into a mass through the law of cohesion; the attractive or cohesive force governing this mass of matter in all substantial respects is of a character with the force that governs society. There is but one difference to be noted, and this, though at first appearing to be a difference in character, is one of degree only. To the original evolutionary force that alike governs all

matter, there came in time to be added the consciousness generated by this force, and in human, as distinguished from "atomic society," this element of consciousness becomes a factor in the processes of evolution.² As viewed from *within* social life, the development of this element of consciousness seems to be an important modification of the evolutionary theory, but as viewed from *without*, it contradicts the theory no more than a rising balloon contradicts the law of gravity. For just as a balloon rises in response to the same law that causes a weight to fall, so the element of consciousness responds to the general process of evolution in the same manner as do all the other properties of matter. As is observed by Spargo in a previously quoted phrase: "Socialists recognize many forces urging mankind onward . . . but *back of them* are the material economic (evolutionary) conditions." In fine, Socialist philosophy holds that society makes man, not man society, and that society itself is a product of material evolution; hence, civil authority is no other than a given evolutionary state of matter.

II. THE STATE

For the expression of civil authority the State is necessary. This is not to say that the State is the expression of civil authority, but that the only means of expressing it is through the State. The State is the expression of society. It is the concrete organization, more or less definite, of society. The State has two essential prerogatives, the distinction between and the sources of which are clearly defined. It is based upon

² Cf. *Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism*, G. Deville, 5.

authority, which is from God, and it is endowed with power, which is from society. These are not only distinct, they are different; they may become incompatible, even contradictory,—as where the State in contravention to divine law declares a valid marriage annulled, or without warrant interferes with the authority of the parent over the child, or in some other manner invades the province of divinely constituted spiritual authority or hinders the due recognition of the supernatural order. It is precisely to such a conflict, wherein the State exercises a power that does not coincide with its authority, that the evil of governments is due. When the authority and the power of the State are in perfect accord, the government is free of evil, although evil exists in society in spite of government. The government is then perfect, not in the sense that it leaves nothing to be desired, but in the sense that its principle is perfect, which is as much as can be said for anything in which man plays a part.

The constitution of a government is not essential to its character; that is to say, the State has no indispensable form, but may be variously constituted. "The right to rule is not necessarily bound up with any special mode of government. It may take this or that form, provided only that it be of a nature to insure the general welfare. But whatever be the nature of government, rulers must ever bear in mind that God is the paramount ruler of the world, and must set Him before themselves as their exemplar and their law in the administration of the State. Everything without exception must be subject to Him and must serve Him."¹ The State's consti-

¹ Encyclical *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII.

tution does not affect its authority, but only its powers, which must be restricted or enlarged to meet the exigencies of time and circumstance. Its authority remains ever the same,—to establish a well-ordered society, to preserve justice, to insure life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to all its people. Where these are to any considerable degree lacking, it is not the authority, but the power of the State that is inadequate. Either its power does not measure up to its authority, or it is misdirected and abused.

Hence, it is clear that whatever faults may be observed in the workings of governments are to be assigned to their misuse of power, which misuse is the inevitable condition of the shortcomings of society itself. Absolute precision in the balance of authority and power are, humanly speaking, impossible, but this zenith mark is none the less the point toward which all right political endeavor must be directed. The fact ever to be borne in mind, without which no permanent advance in politics is possible, is that the evil of governments is in relation to their powers, and their powers spring from the people. These observations will assist us to a correct understanding of the Socialist teaching concerning the State.

“The State,” says Engels, “is simply a product of society at a certain stage of evolution. It is the confession that society is hopelessly divided against itself, has entangled itself in irreconcilable contradictions, which it is powerless to banish. In order that these contradictions may not annihilate society in a useless struggle, a power becomes necessary that stands apparently above society and has the function of keeping down conflicts and main-

taining order. And this power is the State, the most powerful economic class, that by force of its economic supremacy becomes also the ruling political class.”² “For Socialists,” says G. Deville, “the existence of the State is bound up with the existence of classes. Before classes came into being there was no State. Certain economic conditions begot classes. The privileged orders needed means to preserve their position of advantage, and hence, the State was born.”³ “All history,” says Paul Lafargue, “shows that the State is simply the organized force at the disposal of the privileged classes.”⁴ “Governments,” says Geo. D. Herron, “are chiefly the expression of those who have lived off other people and who have made laws for the purpose of compelling those others to support them.”⁵ “There are no words that can make this fact hideous and ghastly enough,” says Herron in another place,—“the fact that society and its institutions are organized for the purpose of enabling some people to live off other people.”⁶ Morris Hillquit expresses the same view: “The Socialist definition of the State as an organization of the ruling class for the maintenance of the exploited classes in a condition of dependence, is entirely correct.”⁷ In fine, according to Socialists, the State is “in the hands of a rapacious minority a terrible engine against an exploited majority,” organized and being maintained “for

² *Origin of the Family, the State and Private Property*, 206.

³ *State and Socialism*, 4.

⁴ *Evolution Economic*, 38.

⁵ *Metropolitan*, May, 1903.

⁶ *Revolution to Revolution*, 10.

⁷ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, 96.

the defense of certain interests of one part of society against the rest of society,"—"an impersonal yet universal beast of prey, expressing the power of the ruling and possessing class to absorb, and to convert into ever-increasing power to absorb, the whole output of the life and labor of humanity."

If the origin and character of the State were such as Socialists describe them in the excerpts above (and these excerpts could be added to indefinitely), no just man could do other than welcome its overthrow, nay, its utter extinction. The Socialists hold out this consolation. They say that "while explaining the origin of the State [we] show in this very origin its future disappearance."⁸ Here is some food for reflection: how the very origin of a thing can show its future disappearance. Are we to suppose that its disappearance will also show its future origin or re-origin? "We are now rapidly approaching a stage of evolution," Engels beneficently informs us, "when classes must fall as inevitably as they once arose, and the State must irrevocably fall with them."⁹ "The moment that class organizations fall," says Bebel (which event, he tells us in the same breath, will be brought about through the abolition of property), "the State loses both the necessity and the possibility of existence. With the abolition of private property and class antagonisms, the State, too, will gradually pass out of existence; will, so to speak, abolish itself."¹⁰ Engels differs from Bebel as to the mode of the State's passing. In another of his Socialist classics (Engels' writings are all

⁸ *Anarchy and Socialism*, Geo. Plechanoff, II.

⁹ *Origin of the Family*, etc., 208.

¹⁰ *Woman*, 272; cf. also, 435.

Socialist classics), he gives this sweeping description of the State's demise: "State interference in social relations becomes superfluous in one domain after another and then dies out of itself. The government of persons is replaced by the administration of things and the conduct of the processes of production. The State is not 'abolished.' *It Dies Out.*"¹¹ Robert Rives LaMonte has yet another theory: "The State is destined, when it becomes the State of the working classes, to remove its own foundations — economic inequality — and thus to commit suicide."¹²

Thus seeing that there are so many ways open for the State to become extinct of itself, we are surprised to learn that Socialists would undertake to destroy it. But such is the case. "Socialists," says Marx, "make war against all prevailing ideas of the State, of country and of patriotism."¹³ "The policy of the Socialists," says Bax, "is to break up the hideous monopolies called empires; everything which makes for the destruction and disintegration of the State to which he belongs is welcomed by the Socialist as an ally."¹⁴ "The field of Socialist political action," we learn from another authoritative source, "is not to reinforce the present State but to capture and destroy it."¹⁵ Paul Lafargue says: "We attack the State in order to destroy it."¹⁶ Chas. H. Vail says: "The Socialist movement is not a reform

¹¹ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, 129.

¹² *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, 113.

¹³ Quoted by DeTunzlemann, *Superstition Called Socialism*, 187.

¹⁴ *Religion of Socialism*, 126.

¹⁵ *The Wage Slave*, April, 1909.

¹⁶ *Economic Evolution*, 28.

but a revolution.”¹⁷ Geo. D. Herron says: “It is not a remedy for the evils of existing society but a program for a new society.”¹⁸ The Socialist ex-Congressman Berger says: “Socialism stands for a new civilization.”¹⁹ Belfort Bax says: “It is toward a world where Civilization shall have ceased to be, that the Socialist of to-day sets his eyes.”²⁰

What will take the place of the State, once Socialists have accomplished their purpose? Such a question, in the estimation of Socialists, does not appear to be of much importance, but we confess to at least a curiosity on this point. Some Socialists frankly admit that they “cannot say what sort of a society the Socialist State will be,”²¹ that it “can no more be described in detail than any other thing that is hidden in the womb of time.”²² Some have the assurance to say that “it is a mark of ignorance to ask for details.” But the majority of them, rather than acknowledge a possible exception to their claim that their philosophy is a “general key for the solution of all the riddles of the universe,” undertake to give a vague sort of description of the future society. The difficulty is not to find these descriptions, but to reconcile with one other, and with other Socialist theories, and with human nature and the nature of things, the abundance that is found. It is out of the question, even in a general way, to reproduce these various ideas of what Socialism might

¹⁷ *The Socialist Movement*, 9.

¹⁸ *Why I Am a Socialist*, 8.

¹⁹ *Socialist Campaign Book*, 1912, 25.

²⁰ *History from the Socialist Standpoint*.

²¹ Herron, *op. cit.*, 31.

²² *Objections to Socialism Answered*, Suthers.

be. Probably the most suggestive among them is that of Deville: "Between the time when the Socialist party shall take possession of the State, in order to realize the suppression of classes (all agree that there will be no classes in Socialisdom), and the time when that suppression shall be actually accomplished, there will be the Socialist State. . . . When the transformation is complete there will be instead of persons to be restrained only things to be administered, and on that glorious day there will be a social organization but no longer a State."²³ We are compelled to admit that a social *organization* that is not a State is past our understanding; we cannot even imagine one. Nor do we receive much light from the statement that this condition will be Social Democracy and that "Social Democracy is actual democracy, . . . an organization of society, which, resting on the equality of men, will choke the source of inequality, will tolerate neither rule nor servant, and will found a fraternal community of free men."²⁴ The view expressed by Morris and Bax is equally unsatisfactory: "As to the political side of the new society, Civilization undertakes the *government of persons* by direct coercion, Socialism would deal primarily with the *administration of things*, and only indirectly would have to do with personal habit and conduct."²⁵

We get a little more assistance from A. M. Simons, who says that "the government would be little more than a gigantic information bureau, furnishing the citizens exact knowledge regarding the amounts of all kinds of com-

²³ *The State and Socialism*, 45.

²⁴ *Socialism*, Liebknecht, 8.

²⁵ *Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome*, 289.

modities required by the community, and notifying them where there is need of labor to be performed.”²⁶ But there are other Socialists, like H. G. Wells and Morris Hillquit, who are not willing to admit that there will be no State in Socialisdom. Mr. Wells outlines a fairly definite form of “The Great State,” in his *Socialist Democracy*, and a contemporary Socialist appraises it as follows: “In a State such as Mr. Wells has in mind, tyranny would be certain. But he is talking about State Socialism. If England passed into State Socialism, I would emigrate. No man who understands liberty, toleration, and equality, could live under State Socialism; it would be hell.”²⁷ Mr. Hillquit says: “The Socialist society, as conceived by modern Socialists, differs very radically from the modern State in form and substance. It is not a class State. It is not the slave-holding State nor the feudal State, nor the State of the bourgeoisie—it is the Socialist State, but a state nevertheless.”²⁸ Mr. Hillquit also suggests the outlines of a possible Socialist State, and his contemporaries proceed to take him to task in no uncertain terms. He points out that “the Socialist commonwealth will need vast material resources, probably more than the modern States, and these resources, in whatever form or under whatever designation, can come only from the wealth producing members (workingmen) of the commonwealth—thus there must be a direct or indirect tax on the labor or income of every citizen.” And thus Hillquit brings about his ears a perfect din from the Socialists who clamor for “all that

²⁶ *Socialism and Anarchism*, 14.

²⁷ Robert Blatchford, in *The Clarion*, July 9, 1910.

²⁸ *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, 100.

labor produces," and he is challenged, in the catch-penny phrase of Debs, to say "if the laborer is not entitled to all he produces, who is?"

Assuredly, when we find in the heart of the Socialist camp such widely divergent views on a question of so great moment, it ought not to be accounted "a mark of ignorance to ask for details." As nearly as we are able to derive a definite idea from the innumerable, conflicting suggestions that we have studied, it is that Socialism would be a social condition in which there would be no civil law. Certainly there would be no classes; merely to hint at the contrary is the rankest of Socialist heresies. This is the one unbroken thread that is woven throughout the fabric of Socialist teaching. And without classes there can be no civil law. If we mistake not the meaning of the philosophy of Socialism, of its history, its tactics, and its aims, of their bearing upon religious, moral, and social life, the sum and substance of its political principles are expressed in the idea of a social existence where there is no civil law.

III. CIVIL LAW

Civil law is a natural consequence of the State's existence. It is necessary to the State's existence. To speak of a State without laws is like speaking of a human body without a soul. Plato says (*Laws*, III-680-A) that certain prehistoric States had no laws, but that "the people lived in obedience to customs and traditional observances." But what were these but laws? Embryonic in their state of development, it is true, but so, also, was the State in which they prevailed. It is law that links together the authority and the power of the State;

law is the expression of this authority and this power; it is the only means whereby these can be expressed, unless it be through force. And what is force that is not lawful? Who will sanction lawless force? But who will refuse to obey law because it is not supported by force? In the answer to these questions is found the unfailing test of civilization. The ranking degree of a society in civilization is gauged by its estimate of law and force. If lawless force be generally sanctioned and law without force be generally disregarded in a society, it is not civilized. And to the extent that this obtains among members of society, though it does not obtain generally, its civilization is not complete. Such members or their dispositions must be eradicated before the society in which they are found can make further advances.

We have here come to a very practical phase of our study, and too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the necessity for its thorough consideration. Broadly speaking, we have reached a point that in actual life marks the backward sweep of the human race, a point that the race has passed over more than once in its history. There have been many States in the world: many are extinct; each has had its own history, its own laws, its own public spirit. There have been great States among them, and the ruins in which we find their monuments buried attest that civilization has suffered losses with its gains. How much of what we now call progress is only a recovery of lost position, how much of our growth only a restoration of former greatness, no one can say. Assyria was great; so was Egypt. Their buried cities, Nineveh, Babylon, Thebes, were great,—how great, we are only beginning to learn and may never

fully know. We have only their ruins to teach us. And who can say that there have not been great States whose ruins even are swept away? Plato has left us a graphic description of "Atlantis," a wonderful country, and it is impossible to say how much of it is due to invention and how much to facts of which we now have no record. But Plato speaks of it more than once (in *Critias* and *Timaeus*) and Homer refers to it in the *Odyssey*, each seeming to regard its existence as real. Of much similar import are the legends—if, indeed, they are legends—of the island of "Brazil," from which the great South American Republic takes its name, as the Atlantic Ocean did from "Atlantis," of Lyonnese, the sunken land off the Cornish coast, of the lost Breton city of Is, of the part of China sunk beneath the Yellow Sea in a catastrophe caused, as the legend runs, by the extensive operation of extractive industries on the part of the ancient Celestials. It would be extremely sceptical to discard all the lore that has grown up in reference to these lost countries as wholly imaginary. Did we know their history, it doubtless would teach us much, and perhaps some things not very flattering to our conceit of twentieth century civilization.

But of those countries whose territory remains a silent witness of States that are buried in the past, though we have not their history, we know enough to be warned that civilization is never secure, that society will never reach a stage where it may relax its vigilance, its authority or its laws. Although some strange alchemy were to change human nature into angelic, the necessity for authority and for laws of society expressing that authority would not be dispensed with: even the angels are sub-

ject. The most that can be said is, that with such an hypothesis realized, there would be no need of force to secure the observance of laws. Politically speaking, this is the highest degree of perfection conceivable: it is the ideal; and if it were required to write in one line the political history of all nations, so that their growth and their decay, their conquests and their surrenders, their achievements and their failures, their happiness and their misery and their net gain over all, would appear as in a panoramic view, the line would nearest meet this requirement that described how law has superseded force from the beginning until now.

There is a fine old English word that fits in here, a word that in three syllables sums up the all-round character of a good citizen. It imports firmness of heart, strength of mind, integrity of purpose. It means love of authority and respect for law. The word is *LOYALTY*. A loyal man is a just man and he can be trusted. He is an honest man and he will trust others. He is a sincere man and he can trust himself. Loyalty — to God, to country, to neighbor and to self — is the high-water mark of a man's civilization.

We come now to consider the Socialist political principle in its relations and bearings toward civil law. Like the heathens of old who worshipped some Unknown God, Socialists are ready to bow down to the law of evolution. But they have no respect for civil law. Though they submit to its force, since they cannot do otherwise, they disown its authority and condemn its principle and only bide the time when they can violate it with impunity or even abolish it altogether. The four-times candidate of the Socialist Party for President of

the United States expresses this attitude in terms that do not admit of doubt as to their meaning. "As a revolutionist," says Mr. Debs, "I have no respect for property laws nor the least scruple about violating them. I hold all such laws to have been enacted through chicanery, fraud and corruption, with the sole end in view of dispossessing, robbing and enslaving the working class. But this does not imply that I propose making an individual lawbreaker of myself and butting my head against a wall. If I had the force to overthrow these despotic laws, I would use it without an instant's hesitation or delay, but I haven't got it, and so I am a law-abiding citizen under protest — not from scruple — and I bide my time." This edifying utterance appeared in the *International Socialist Review* for February, 1912, and was written in response to the criticism provoked by a paragraph appearing in a pamphlet issued late in 1911 by W. D. Haywood and Frank Bohn,¹ which reads as follows: "When the worker, either through experience or a study of Socialism, comes to know this truth [that he is daily robbed of four-fifths of his labor], he acts accordingly. He retains absolutely no respect for the property 'rights' of the profit-takers. He will use any weapon that will win his fight. He knows that the laws of property are made by and for the capitalists, therefore, he does not hesitate to break them." Debs, in the magazine article quoted, came forward as the champion of the Socialist orthodoxy of this expression (and who shall say 'nay' to Debs when he poses as the spokesman of American Socialists) and under the title, "Sound Socialist Tac-

¹ *Industrial Socialism*. The paragraph quoted is found at page 57.

tics," he endorses the Haywood-Bohn paragraph as follows: "We here have a method of tactics upon which a number of comrades of ability have sharply disagreed (on tactical grounds). For my part I consider the paragraph entirely sound. It speaks for itself and needs no apology. The workers will use any weapon which help them *WIN* their fight." Appearing also in this article is another paragraph which we quote: "There will be all kinds of extremists to deal with [in deciding upon tactics]. But we have nothing to fear. Let them all have their day. The great body of the comrades, the rank and file, will not be misled by false teachings or deflected from the true course." We cannot help but wonder what the writer means by "extremists," "false teachings," etc. Perhaps some light is reflected upon his meaning by a previous article from him that treats of the celebrated McNamara cases, in which he says: "I abhor murder, but I have my own ideas as to what constitutes murder. . . . As between this blind and cruel extreme [of the McNamaras] and the opposite extreme of cowardly surrender, the former is infinitely preferable. . . . If the McNamara case teaches us anything, it is that we must *organize*." ² But still we wonder: what does the McNamara case teach them to *organize* for?

There also appears in the *Review*, in the same issue with Debs' "Tactics," the full text of Haywood's famous (not to say infamous) "Cooper Union" speech of January, 1912, in which he is quoted as saying, between interruptions of applause by his audience of Socialists: "I say that I *despise the law* and I am *not* a law-abiding citizen. And more than that, no Socialist *CAN*

² *International Socialist Review*, January, 1912.

be a law-abiding citizen. When we come together, . . . we become conspirators against the United States government. . . . Am I correct? Am I absolutely correct when I state this as being the position of the Socialist Party, not only of New York, but of the United States, and of every nation of the world?" The answer given by the audience was "applause." And within sixty days after this treasonable utterance was heralded to the world, Haywood was elected by the direct vote of Socialist party members, Debs' "rank and file," as one of the National Executive Committee, which is composed of eight members, he having received the second highest number of votes cast by his admiring Comrades. Later, he was removed from this position by referendum ballot, because of his tactless activity in behalf of the Industrial Workers of the World. However, so far as our advices go, he is still a Socialist in good standing. Commenting upon the utterance quoted, Robert Rives LaMonte has this to say: "As a matter of fact most Socialists are law-abiding citizens. We are because we have to be [as are the most notorious convicted criminals]. The other fellows have the law-enforcing power. We know it. We know it is futile for the *individual* to defy the law. Had Haywood said we are not *law-respecting* citizens, his position would have been impregnable, for it is true. The Socialist whose Socialism is more than skin-deep, always whistles at the law. . . . In the tyrannies of Europe the people need no urging to spit upon the law. Here in America we are cursed by a superstitious and paralysing reverence for the law. And one of the chief objects of Socialist propaganda is to teach the workers that our states are Class States, that our courts are

Class Courts, and that our laws are Class Laws. Every class-conscious worker whistles at the law, but he obeys it. He knows that force is back of it. But while he obeys the law, he keeps on steadily organizing the power that will enable him to overthrow the law. . . . Respect for law, respect for the 'sacred rights of private property,' are the stone walls against which every Socialist agitator is continually ramming his long-suffering head. This wall we must batter down."³

Socialist expressions like these could be multiplied without limit. Whether or not the lawlessness indicated would manifest itself in desperate deeds under favorable conditions, we can learn only from history. Probably the most thoroughly lawless uprising that ever occurred in history was that of the Paris Commune of 1871, the glorification of which is a common Socialist theme. This occurred just after the Franco-Prussian war. France was prostrate as a result of that war; the German armies were still within her boundaries, and the five-billion indemnity required of her was still unpaid. Paris had barely awakened from the nightmare of the most terrible siege a modern city ever suffered; its citizenry barely realized that the ordinary channels of food-supply were again open and that horseflesh was no longer an exclusive culinary dainty. Then arose the Commune. All of the lawless elements of the city, headed by Socialists, taking advantage of the conditions, joined in a seven days' orgy. There were pillages and burnings and massacres in all parts of the ill-fated city. The grand palace of the Tuileries, with its priceless treasures of art and science, was blown up; nearly every public building was

³ *International Socialist Review*, Feb., 1912.

destroyed; the residences of the rich were set aflame in every quarter; churches were pillaged, homes were sacked, priests were murdered, women were violated; forty thousand people were killed in the streets. It is said that the Seine ran red with human blood.⁴ The following revolting incident is related by the Socialist Benham: Archbishop Darbey, who is described by contemporaries as a most lovable man, honored by rich and poor alike for his charity, was brought before the Socialist Rigault, who was sitting as a magistrate. When asked by that self-constituted worthy as to his occupation, the Archbishop said: "I am a servant of God." "Where does He live?" asked Rigault, and the Archbishop replied: "Everywhere." "Send this man to the Concierge," commanded the Socialist by way of retort, "and issue a warrant for the arrest of his Master, one called God, who has no fixed place of abode and is therefore a vagabond." The Archbishop was shot. "Every year," says the Socialist Bax, "witnesses thousands of gatherings of Socialists throughout the civilized world to commemorate this — alas! only temporary — victory of organized Socialist aspiration over the forces of property and privilege."⁵ "There is no martyrdom so splendid," said George D. Herron, in a much featured address at one of these inspiring gatherings in New York, 1903, "none so disinterested and so truly noble, so worthy of being sung in epic and told in story, as the mighty martyrdom of the workingmen of Paris in the spring of 1871." At the time he made this speech Herron perhaps

⁴ Cf. Gabriel Hanitoux's "Contemporary France." See also the Socialist Benham's *Proletarian Revolt*.

⁵ *Short History of the Commune*.

was the foremost figure in the American Socialist movement.

There are positions in which a single word will sometimes convey more meaning than a fully developed tract. This is true of a word as used by the Socialist Hervé. Speaking of the "small merchants, small employers, small peasant proprietors, wretched, impoverished, uneducated people in the ranks of the Socialist party," he said that "these are elements that cannot be neglected," and the reason he gives for this conclusion is that "these classes often have a *beautiful* revolutionary temperament." So to characterize the disposition to overthrow all civilized institutions requires an unfathomable depth of social depravity, such indeed as indicates a madness with which there is no reckoning.

But it is energetically urged by Socialists that their opposition to the law is justified because the law is "wrong." This argument has a specious appearance, and when vigorously pressed by respectable persons, it seldom fails to win favor in the minds of the multitude. It is not difficult to understand how it may be urged with sincerity. There are few things in life more revolting to man's sense of justice than wrong practiced by means of a law. Just as there is no rule so noble as the rule of the law, so there is no tyranny so despicable as the tyranny of a law, and to be forced to suffer such tyranny, as many unquestionably are, arouses in all honest men a just indignation and in not a few a blind passion. As a result of the passionate extreme, which, though not excusable, is still not wholly unpardonable, the points of the mind are dulled and it cannot probe to the core of things with precision. It is not surprising, therefore,

that many persons of the best intentions, seeing numerous instances of injustice in society, lose their grasp of the distinction between law and the abuse of law, between lawful opposition to *a* law and lawless opposition to *the* law. A particular law may be bad, may call for complete and immediate abrogation. The law itself requires the abrogation of a bad law. Such a law is not truly *law*, but a mere statute, though even as such, unless contradictory to God's law, it requires obedience until it is abrogated as the law provides. But *the law* cannot be bad; it cannot lawfully be abrogated; it cannot lawfully be opposed. It is contrary to the very nature of the law to be other than good, since it is the expression of authority, and authority is from God. It is, therefore, plain beyond doubt that opposition to *the* law, as distinguished from *a* law, is not to be tolerated even in the mind, much less in words and actions. If the Socialist opposition to law, whether expressed in word or deed, be opposition to the law, or to law in general, it properly comes within this censure, and a clear-sighted man is not at his best when according it sanction. If this opposition is not so broad, but is only to a certain law or to certain laws which might be lawfully abrogated, then, having pointed out such laws, Socialists are entitled to be heard on the merits of their opposition to them; otherwise, there cannot be merit to consider. That the Socialist opposition is of the character first referred to appears too plain for dispute. The language of Socialists is most unfortunately chosen if they would claim the contrary. Their purposes are wholly inconsistent with their philosophy if they intend the contrary. Not only are their teachings expressly opposed to all existing laws, but their aim seems

unmistakably to be the establishment of a society in which there will not be law. We offer the following authorities in this connection:

"One of the first measures of a definite Socialist authority of administration would be the closing of all civil courts."⁶ "There would be no criminal courts or prosecuting attorneys or police."⁷ "Together with the State must go its representatives, ministers, parliaments, armies, police, courts, lawyers, prisons and prison officials, tax collectors, in short, the entire political apparatus."⁸ "In consequence, there will naturally be no need of laws at this stage of evolution."⁹ "We are quite sure that after the Social revolution there will be no need or room for legislation."¹⁰ Kautsky says that public opinion will be the only rule or law in the new society. Dietzgen says that unlimited social progress will be the only command. Untermann says that a knowledge of the universal processes of nature will be the only requirement. Vail says that the world probably will be governed by the touch of a button. Vowels says that the very laws of nature may be dispensed with and he contemplates future generations as being in control of the earth's course and velocity and as steering "our planet nearer and near the sun as its heat and splendor wane." Engels sees no reason "why man will not be able to produce life." Fourier believed the ocean might be turned into lemonade, etc., etc.

⁶ *Outlooks from the New Standpoint*, Belfort Bax, 103.

⁷ *Passing of Capitalism*, Isadore Ladoff, 99.

⁸ *Woman*, Bebel, 435.

⁹ *Socialism and Anarchism*, Simons, 14.

¹⁰ LaMonte's letter in *Men vs. Men*, 212.

There is but one meaning to all such nonsense. It is that there is no God, that man is a law unto himself, that whatever he wills to do, there is no authority and no law and no power, human, natural or divine, to prevent his doing. Here is the trouble with Socialists all along the line: they refuse to acknowledge the limitations of man or the infinity of God. Neglectful, if not contemptuous, of these truths, they become involved in one absurdity after another, finally mistaking good for evil and sorrow for rejoicing. They follow their blind leaders along dark ways, until they plunge into chaos. They listen to the insane utterances of Marx and Engels and Ferri and Bebel and Blatchford and Bax, of Herron, Thurston, Untermann, Ladoff, Labriola, and others, until their minds are like miniature maelstroms whose giddy whirlings carry them down into intellectual limbo.

The biggest reality in all this world is the fact that man's powers are limited. Where, we know not, but somewhere; — he cannot "live without dining"; he cannot create life. But a reality that is bigger than the very world — than all the worlds — is God. To build a government, a society, a system of thought, a single theory, in disregard of these facts is as impossible as to build a city in the air. To live without knowing these facts, to die without admitting them, is impossible, — even for that curious species known as a "scientific, class-conscious Socialist." The Socialist unwittingly admits this impossibility in every line of his philosophy. He admits it in the very act of denying the existence of God and the limitations of man. For how could he deny these without having first conceived their existence? And how could he conceive their existence if their existence

were not *conceivably* possible? But how could their existence be conceivably possible to man if *he* has no limitations? And how could he be limited except by *Something*? Here we get the two big facts,—the limits of the world, and the limitlessness of the world's Limitator.

The Socialist admits these facts in a more direct manner. From the Alpha to the Omega of his teachings, every word uttered, every thought suggested, points to increasing and rendering more accessible man's food supply. Why does he not cut the matter short by teaching that man can live without a food supply? Man cannot. But why can he not? Here we have a definite mark of a limit and a Limitator which even Socialists have not yet essayed to pass over. A limit and a Limitator means a subject and a Sovereign. It means law and Authority. It means government for man individually, and government for men in society. These require the State, civil law, ruler and ruled in society, however perfect it may be.

The political principle of Socialism, therefore, is false.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SOCIAL PRINCIPLE

I. SOCIALITY

Although much of the bearing of Socialism upon social life has been indicated in previous chapters, the better understanding of our subject requires more particular consideration of this phase. Social life, or as it has of late years come to be termed, sociality, stands midway between morality and politics. It is distinguished from morality by its having for its basis, not universal principles or fixed laws or a common conscience, but local traditions, changing customs, divergent tastes, temperaments and dispositions. It is distinguished from politics by its being the expression, not of organized society or society in the concrete, but of the individuals in society, or society in the abstract. Putting it another way: morality, practically speaking, governs the act of an individual toward an individual; sociality governs the act of an individual toward a class; politics governs the act of a class towards an individual.

These distinctions are more apparent in theory than in practice. For in practice, the bounds of morality, sociality, and politics so frequently overlap that the lines of demarkation are obscured. Still, it may not be gainsaid that, with certain limitations understood, there are many matters affecting social life that are normally out-

side the sphere of both morality and politics, such as what one shall eat, what wear, whom marry, where live, how work, with whom associate, etc. In fact, it is one of those seeming paradoxes to which the poverty of human language occasionally gives rise, that sociality is the indispensable guaranty of individuality. With the passing of man's freedom of choice in those things affecting his personal taste or temperament or his peculiar disposition, passes so much of his individual self. This does not imply that man may not relinquish these things without impairing his individuality so long as he does so voluntarily, but it does imply that he may not be required to relinquish them. Indeed, it is through voluntary sacrifice that a person, by putting aside immediate desires for remote benefits, exercises the highest order of individuality; and it is for this reason that in human society, sociality, which requires sacrifice, and individuality, which expects benefit, are inseparably bound together. This would not be the case were human beings not endowed with rational faculties. It is peculiarly a rational act that foregoes immediate or temporary for remote or permanent benefit. Nor with man would individuality beget sociality in any marked degree, except for his belief in a life hereafter, where he will reap for himself the benefit which for others he foregoes here. Not believing in a future life, his very faculty of reason would prompt in man the most exclusive individuality in this life and sociality would be incompatible with self interest and would naturally cease to exist.

If we consider on the one hand that Socialism is the evolution of mechanical forces that work blindly toward an inevitable end, we must conclude that sociality, as that

term is defined, can be regarded by it as only a sort of will-o'-the-wisp that lures mankind away from the solid ground of physical necessity to no purpose. If we consider on the other hand that Socialism is an all-comprehensive political movement that purposes to fix the last detail of human conduct, we must conclude that under its régime, human liberty, and therefore human happiness, would be reduced to a minimum. Both of these ideas are so repugnant to the common sense of man that we should expect to find in Socialism at least a promise of better things to account for its growing popularity. And we do find such a promise, indeed, we find many such promises, in Socialist propaganda. But they are only promises, and the more numerous they are, and the brighter the prospect they hold out, the more hopeless becomes their realization and the more disappointed will be they who put faith in them.

II. SOCIAL CLASSES

Society is made up of classes. History does not mention a society that was ever constituted otherwise. There is no sound basis for a belief that there ever was or ever will be one constituted otherwise. And it is to be hoped not. For classes are desirable, if not essential. We are assured that there are classes among the angels and that in the "Father's House" there are many mansions.

But there are classes and classes. There are classes that spring from the natural differences to be found in the character, the competency, the gifts, the graces,—physical, mental, moral and spiritual,—of different persons. These are both necessary and desirable. They

obtain everywhere; and they endure. Without them achievement would be impossible and life desolate. Again there are classes that rest on artificial distinctions created in society. These come and go; they are often unnecessary. They may or may not be desirable. They clearly are not desirable in so far as their artificial lines interfere with the proper adjustment, according to class, of the natural differences existing among men, which they not infrequently do.

The lines that separate the natural classes are elastic, variable and never altogether certain. The transition from one class to another is natural, largely automatic, dependent upon merit, as evidenced by effort and achievement. The lines that separate the artificial classes are rigid, fixed, and clearly drawn. Membership in them is arbitrarily controlled and often dependent upon favor, intrigue, or the like. There are numerous classes of each type in most societies. One person may at the same time be a member of several of each type. A single class may combine the characteristics of both types, being neither altogether natural nor yet wholly artificial, but at the same time a distinct class. Indeed, it may be said that modern society is made up of so many intricate phases that most classes present such a combination; and hence, most of them are likely to present some undesirable features. By unduly stressing these features, sensational exploiters, working upon the plastic minds of certain among the classes, have of late years aroused in them a spirit of opposition to other classes, and Socialist propagandists take advantage of this spirit to win favor for the doctrine that all class distinctions are unjustifiable in principle and intolerable in fact, arising from an institu-

tionalized system of robbery and resulting in an incessant and deadly conflict.

This doctrine does not conform to the truth anywhere along the line, not even at the point where the reprehensible traits of classes stand out. In the main, classes originate in nature's universal variety; and they result in mutual aid, not in conflict. To condemn them *in toto* on account of some objectionable features, is much like inveighing against the law of life and growth because of the accidental or unexplained instances of arrested development to be observed throughout nature. DeTunzlemann, in *The Superstition Called Socialism*, likens this indiscriminate censure of class distinctions to the act of a gardener who, in order to be rid of the weeds in his garden, plows up the garden itself, destroying fruit and flowers with the noxious plants. In his *Man Without a Country*, Edward Everett Hale has drawn a vivid picture of the unhappy situation of a classless man, and if we raise this picture to the *nth* power, we can imagine what a society without classes would be.

It has been said that there is no solitude like the solitude of a great city. By analogy it would seem that no exile would so completely isolate man from his fellows as to be a member of a classless society. Classes beget sociality. Sociality preserves individuality. Individuality marks man off from the rest of the animal world. The teaching that would affect the status of these things must be examined critically. The teaching that would abolish them must be rejected. The Socialist movement, which in this particular is a class-conscious movement toward a classless society, cannot secure the approval of right-thinking men. It strikes down all that is most

precious to earthly existence and it raises a disconsolate cry from hearts that would weep over the ruins of civilization.

III. CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS

The dominant characteristic of Socialism, as viewed from the standpoint of social life, is its doctrine of class-consciousness. From its economic basis that labor creates all value, to the ultimate development of its philosophy and its politics, the Socialist movement is marked by a uniform trend in the direction of class-consciousness. The chief aim of all Socialist endeavor is to arouse in the members of the working class a keen realization of common interest and a militant spirit of common purpose, such as will exclude all other classes from consideration, and it counts no effort too costly and no sacrifice too great that makes toward this end. It is not enough that the individuals of this class *believe* that they have a common interest and a common aim; they must become utterly absorbed by this belief to the point of self-effacement, so that not so much as a ripple may "disturb the smooth-flowing surface of proletarian thought."

The doctrine of class-consciousness rests upon the theory of the class-struggle, which holds that all society is divided into capitalists and workingmen, and that between these classes there exists a deadly and interminable conflict. This theory does not allow the existence of any other class than these two, and of these two only the working class or the proletariat ought of right to exist. Perhaps not all Socialists are so bold as London, who says: "There are no good capitalists and no bad work-

ingmen; every capitalist is our enemy and every workman our friend,"¹ but nearly if not quite all subscribe to practically the same idea set out in the Socialist platform in the declaration that "the working class is the only class that has the right to be," and nearly all entertain the belief expressed by Herron when he says that, "until the working class realizes that it is the disinherited owner of the world and that there is no possible reconciliation or compromise between it and the employing class, its efforts will be blind and helpless, beaten, baffled and betrayed."²

The Socialists uniformly claim that in the war of the classes they have espoused the cause of the working class or the propertyless class, often by them referred to as the proletariat. Rather, they claim that the Socialist movement is a movement of the proletariat. "The interests of the proletarian," says Austin Lewis, "are the materialization of Socialist philosophy; the ideas of the proletariat are the ideas of Socialism; the aspirations of the proletariat are the aspirations of Socialism; the triumph of Socialism will be the triumph of the proletariat. There can be no question of the inseparability of Socialism and the proletariat. The social revolution is admittedly dependent upon the self-conscious growth of the proletarian class. In so far as the Socialist movement stands for the proletarian class, it is in accord with fundamental Socialist doctrines; wherever it steps aside from its service to the proletariat, it is recreant to them. The strength of the proletariat depends, not upon the votes it polls, or the parliamentary seats it occupies, or

¹ *Revolution* (Yale address, 1906).

² *Revolution to Revolution*, 4.

the number of municipalities it controls in the name of Socialism, but upon the degree with which it pursues the interests of the proletarian exclusively.”³ Liebknecht says: “For our party and for our party tactics, there is but one valid basis, the basis of the class-struggle. The founders of our party, Marx, Engels and Lassalle, impressed upon the workingmen the necessity of the *class* character of our movement so deeply that down to a very recent time there was no getting off the track, no deviating.”⁴

The deviations suggested by Liebknecht are to be found chiefly among English-speaking Socialists. Hyndman and McDonald vigorously repel the Socialist idea of a class division and the consequent class-war and class-conscious doctrine. Hyndman affirms that there are more than two economic classes in every community, and he pointedly suggests the trinity of laborer, farmer, and landlord as being in the field of agriculture “as compact a little set of antagonisms within this field as any in our society.”⁵ McDonald goes a step further, and points out intellectual and moral classes as well as economic: “The antagonisms of society are not merely economic; they are also intellectual and moral. The richest possession of any man is an approving conscience. The scheme by which humanity evolves to higher stages of existence is either *rational* or it is not. If it is not, then, all efforts to hasten reform — Socialism included — are waste efforts. If it is rational, a man seeking intellectual peace as well as economic security will have to choose

³ *The Militant Proletariat*, 7, 13.

⁴ *No Compromise*.

⁵ *Socialism and Society*, 135.

which he is to pursue.”⁶ Mr. McDonald fails to consider that Socialist philosophy allows that a thing, or *no* thing, can be both rational and non-rational, or neither rational or non-rational, or both and neither, all at the same time; hence, while his reasoning appeals to us with telling force, it is lost upon his “scientific” comrades.

But such views as those of Hyndman and McDonald are notable for their rarity among Socialists. They are introduced here as exceptions that prove the rule and to fix more definitely the hard and fast Socialist dogma of a class-war that can never be terminated except through the class-consciousness of the proletariat. We are not confined to the expressions of individual Socialists on this point, but have in addition, the official utterances of the Socialist organizations of all countries; and, while we realize that these utterances are in general unreliable, since they are tactical expressions originating in motives of expediency, still, as bearing upon the question under immediate discussion, it seems that in view of their uniformity they may not be summarily rejected. The first principle set out in the famous Communist Manifesto is that “The history of hitherto existing societies is the history of the class-struggle,” and the last sentence in that document is a dramatic appeal to the proletarian classes of the world: “Proletarians of all countries, unite!” These words “have become the universal war cry of Socialism; they may be regarded as the very essence of the Socialist movement.”⁷ To the same effect is the Erfurt Program: “The class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is the common mark of

⁶ *Socialism and Society*, 135-140.

⁷ *The Militant Proletariat*, A. Lewis, 7.

all industrial countries, it divides modern society into two opposing camps, and the warfare between them constantly increases in bitterness." The Socialist Party platform adopted at Chicago, in 1908, is very similar: "The struggle between the wage worker and the capitalist grows ever fiercer and has now become the only vital issue before the American people . . . wage workers are the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of capitalists, . . . have the most direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system." The Indianapolis platform, of 1912, sets the matter out somewhat more fully: "Society is divided into two warring groups or classes, based upon material (economic) interests. . . . The working class vastly outnumbers the capitalist class. Lacking effective organization and class solidarity (class-consciousness), this class is unable to enforce its will. Given such class solidarity and effective organization, the workers will have the power to make all laws and control all industry in their own interests. . . . The Socialist Party is the political expression of the interests of the workers. The only reliance left the workers is economic organization and political power. By the intelligent and class-conscious use of these they may successfully resist the capitalist class, break the fetters of wage slavery and fit themselves for the future society which is to displace the capitalist system. . . . Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government, in order that they may lay hold of the whole system of socialized industry and thus come into their rightful inheritance."

Before considering what is involved in this doctrine of

proletarian class-consciousness, we should learn, if possible, who are included in this class. This large word has been forced into English usage through the insistent pedantry of Socialist writers. Its application is not strictly defined. It is a term derived from the legal phraseology of ancient Rome, where there existed a class known as the *proletarii*, the nearest equivalent to which in modern society perhaps is the class of vagrants. *Proletaire* was introduced into French literature about the time of the first Revolution, to designate persons without estate or position who neither worked nor begged. It is used in the Communist Manifesto to designate the class of persons represented in the Socialist movement. In a note to an annotated edition of this well-known pronunciamento, Engels says that the term *proletariat* "means the class of modern wage-laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor in order to live." But the accuracy of this definition is placed in doubt by a paragraph of the Manifesto that reads: "Capitalism has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-laborers. The lower strata of the middle class — small trades-people, shopkeepers, retired tradesmen generally, handicraftsmen, and peasants — all these gradually sink into the proletariat." As used generally in Socialist literature, the words workingmen, wage-earners, servants, slaves, employed classes, propertyless classes, and proletarians are synonymous. The Indianapolis platform (1912) defines the working class as including "all those persons who are compelled to work for a living, whether by hand or brain, in shop or mines, or upon the soil." Thus defined, the term prole-

tariat includes persons of skill and ability; "but only a scant minority of these come into the Socialist movement," says the Socialist Lewis, "and such as come, generally speaking, are but of dubious value. The most part consists of those who are unable to succeed in their chosen vocations. They come in as a broken minority, usually bankrupt, not only economically, but intellectually as well."⁸

In fine, socially speaking, Socialism appears to be a sort of rallying ground where not only the down-trodden of society, but the incompetent, the indigent, the unfit, — in a word, the bankrupt, whether so through their own fault or the fault of others, may gather together in one confused class of restless, discontented, clamoring "proletarians," who in one way or another are at war with the rest of mankind for real or fancied wrongs that they have suffered. That their warring may prove to some purpose, Socialism would eradicate all differences and distinctions within this class and through the magic of the phrase "class-conscious," crystallize its nondescript members into a huge, unyielding mass, that, with the original impulse given to its beaten units, will move forward as a solid body to displace all other bodies that it cannot crush. We say "forward" through force of habit. Thinking of a considerable movement as being other than forward is so unusual that one off-hand links the united efforts of the defeated classes with the forward idea. But, in truth, this class-conscious movement is not forward; at least it is not consistently forward. Its direction is not toward any point, but merely

⁸ *The Militant Proletariat*, 35.

against an object. It is a bodily movement of the losers against the winners in the race for social achievement, wherein the former strive, not to outstrip the latter in other trials of skill, but to weaken and hinder them and by sheer force of numbers, all working to one purpose, to put them forever out of the race, so that running will be no longer necessary, but only standing still.

That social life would be reduced to a very low plane by the scheme suggested in the class-conscious idea, is a conclusion that is not open to question. Kautsky has drawn a vivid word-picture of what life would mean to the individual in a society where this idea prevailed. He portrays such a society as an entity of awe-inspiring proportions, whose crushing effect on the individual is so overpowering that the strongest has not the strength to dissent from the public mind. "It needs no further means," he says, "to secure the undisturbed course of social life."⁹ His dread picture would fill the hearts of free men with a paralysing fear, were there any chance that the insane idea of class-consciousness could ever be other than insane.

Of far more importance, however, is the result produced in society by the energetic teaching of class-consciousness. For the very idea is enervating and degrading, destructive alike of the good citizenship, good morals, and self-respect of those who subscribe to it and live up to its consequences. That this is not mere invective is amply attested by all class-conscious Socialists who deal frankly with the subject. There are few who are so brutally frank as Robert Blatchford, but we are aware of none who have taken issue with Blatch-

⁹ *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, 188.

ford's views. He says: "There are many who think that if all the workers were to give up drink, work hard, live sparingly, save their earnings, they would all be happy and prosperous. . . . Now, I know that belief to be all wrong. I know that if every working man and woman in England turned teetotaler to-morrow, if they all worked like niggers, if they worked twelve hours a day, if they lived on oatmeal and water, and if they saved every farthing they could spare, at the end of twenty years they would be a great deal worse off than they are to-day. Sobriety, thrift, industry, skill, self-denial, holiness . . . simply enrich the idle and wicked and reduce the industrious and righteous to slavery. Teetotalism will not do, saving will not do, increased skill will not do. Nothing *will* do but Socialism. I mean to make these things plain if it takes me till Christmas. . . . Is it not true that in France, in Germany, and all other countries where the workers live more sparingly and are more temperate than the workers are in England, the wages are lower and the hours of work longer? And is it not true that the Chinese and the Hindoos, who are the most temperate and the most thrifty people in the world, are the worst paid? . . . Don't you see that if the Lancashire workers would live on rice and water, the masters would soon have their wages down to the rice and water point?"¹⁰ Is it to be supposed that teaching like this will promote the practice of the virtues here viewed as harmful to workers? If those virtues only go to enrich the idle, while they enslave the industrious,

¹⁰ *Imprudent Marriages*, 4-19. Cf. also, *Merrie England*, by Blatchford, chaps. xx and xxi, on "Industry" and "Environment."

are not Haywood and Bohn correct in saying: "It is ridiculous for sane people to work all day and every day; 'The less work the better,' is the motto for workers"?¹¹ Is not Kauffman suggesting the true Socialist tactic when he says that "the employee who does as little as he may do and still hold his job, decreases by just so much his employer's profit"?¹² In an essay entitled, "Wage-Labor and Capital," Marx says: "The more the working man labors, the less reward he receives for it; for this simple reason—he competes against his fellow workmen, and thus compels them to compete against him, and thus, as a last result, he competes against himself."

This is truly a remarkable "discovery." But Marx made one still more remarkable. After discovering that the more the workingman works, the less he gets in return, he discovered that the more he gets in return, the worse off he is; higher wages means lower pay in the end. Marx "reasons" on this point as follows: "Although [when wages are higher] the laborer has a larger amount of commodities at his disposal than he had before, yet his wages have nevertheless diminished in proportion to the capitalist's gain. He has to produce a larger amount of surplus value than he did before. The value of capital is raised in proportion to the value of labor and the capitalist commands a larger amount of labor with the same amount of capital. The *power* of the capitalist class over the laboring class is *increased*, the social position of the laborer has deteriorated."¹³

¹¹ *Industrial Unionism*, 62.

¹² *What Is Socialism?* 110.

¹³ *Wage-Labor and Capital*, 21.

The deceptive character of a higher wage thus imagined by Marx is a common mark supposed by Socialists to attach to all benefits that workingmen acquire or have acquired through long bleeding centuries. "Viewed from the *absolute* standpoint," says Vail, "the laborer may enjoy more privileges to-day than in years gone by; but from the *relative* standpoint—his condition as compared to other classes—there is a greater gulf separating him from the classes above than ever before."¹⁴ "It is this feature of present-day progress that Socialists view as the very essence of injustice," says Walling; "no matter though there is a slight and continuous or even a considerable progress of the working class, the question for them is not whether from time to time more falls to the workingman, but what he gets of the whole. . . . It is absurd to tell the workingman that the advance he is making either through improvements as to wages and hours, or through political and social reforms, ought to blind him to the possibilities of civilization, which will remain out of his reach until his share in the income of society is increased to the point that he receives the total product."¹⁵ It is on this account that Kautsky says: "The class struggle becomes more bitter the longer it lasts; the more capable of struggle the opponents become, the more important become the differences in the conditions of life, the more the capitalists raise themselves above the proletariat."¹⁶ Therefore, it is not so much a question of improving the workingman's condition, as it is of bringing down the capitalist.

¹⁴ *Principles of Scientific Socialism*, 211.

¹⁵ *Socialism as It Is*, 281.

¹⁶ *Die Neue Zeit*, Oct. 27, 1911.

Class-consciousness means the unification of all envious and hateful passions rather than an organized sentiment crying for justice. "If there were democracy in our poverty," says John Spargo, who by the way is far from poverty stricken, "so that none were idle or rich, while the rest toiled in poverty, it would be our supreme glory to bear it with courage."¹⁷

The spirit evinced in these writings reminds one of Christ's parable of the master and the vineyard. The master hired workers about the sixth and ninth hours, and they agreed to work for a penny. Then about the eleventh hour he set others to work, and when the day was done, he gave every man a penny. But those who had worked longer grumbled, not because they had not received their share, but because the others received as much as they. The master's rebuke to the envious workers is sublime; and fitting here: "Friend, I do thee no wrong. Is thine eye evil because I am good? Take what is *thine* and go thy way." Socialists are like these grumblers. They have been working,—we will grant, though as to many it is too much to grant,—since an early hour of the Long Day. Their position has constantly improved since the beginning; their hours have been shortened, their wages have been increased, their labor has been lightened, their surroundings have been made safe, wholesome, and even attractive as compared to what they were; they enjoy more privileges now than ever before and their rights are better secured, and these benefits are being multiplied steadily as the Long Day passes. But they are not satisfied. They grumble because others fare better than they. How well they really

¹⁷ *The Common Sense of Socialism*, 46.

fare, how well they might fare did others *not* fare better, they never pause to consider. They see others enjoying privileges that they do not and their eye is "evil." They are blind to the fact that those whom they envy have advanced over obstacles that have baffled themselves, have gone forward at a pace which they cannot match. They are blind to the uplift made possible to them only through the advance of others. Envy is always blind. It fills the brain with a distorted image that shuts out the light on all sides. It fills the heart with a bitter passion that rises up to assail the mind and strikes to unseat reason. It is no wonder that class-conscious Socialists discard merit, ignore justice, decry virtue! They are obsessed with envy at the welfare of others, and all angles of their mental vision are focused by this light-absorbing passion. Wherever their teachings are permitted to take root, the effect on social life cannot be other than mischievous, and if by any chance they should come to bear full fruit, the beauty and the glory of our civilization seem bound to perish as a consequence. It is not sufficient consolation for such a fatal issue that the evils afflicting society possibly would be abated thereby. Deplorable as these evils are, inexcusable as some of them are, we

"Rather bear the ills we have
Than fly to those we know not of."

There is no comfort to be found in the cock-sure assertions of Socialists, who would "blot out God from the universe," leave "Heaven to the angels and the sparrows," and create a perpetual paradise in this vale of

tears. They remind us of the familiar lines of De Morgan's *Budget of Paradoxes*; they

“Chirp, chirp, chirp with a grasshopper's glee —
We're the lamps of the universe, we, we! *we!*”

The economics of Socialism would deprive man of property; its philosophy would deprive him of reason; its religion would deprive him of God; its class-conscious politics would fittingly crown this desolate picture by sweeping out of his life all incentive and all hope for individual enterprise and achievement.

SECOND PART
HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

THE IDEA

I. PLATONIC

"Now, then, let us construct our imaginary city from the beginning." These words of the great Athenian philosopher shadow forth the basis of all Socialistic ideas. They imply a belief that society can be constructed along artificial and arbitrary lines, and this belief is a necessary prerequisite of all agitation looking to the socialization of society. This belief is not original with Plato. It obtained probably a thousand years before his time. In Crete, as early as 1300 B. C., all civic institutions were constructed upon an artificial basis. The Carthaginian and Lacedæmonian institutions were of a like character. The institutions and laws given by Lycurgus to Sparta probably were the chief source of Plato's inspiration, though he seems also to have drawn freely from Solon, the Athenian lawgiver, Charondas, who legislated for the Chalcidian cities in Italy and Sicily, Philolaus, the Theban, and Hippodamus of Miletus, the last of whom is said by Aristotle to be "the first person not a statesman who made inquiries about the best form of government and who must be credited with having invented the art of planning cities."

But if not the inventor, Plato is the undisputed master of the art of constructing a society on an artificial

basis. In all of his "Dialogues," but principally in his *Republic* and *Laws*, the aim that seems ever uppermost in his mind is to teach the practicability of constructing a perfect State by arbitrary process. He is unquestionably the best exponent of this general idea who has yet appeared. St. Augustine, More, Campanella, Bacon, Harrington, Saint-Simon, Morelly, Rousseau, and all other writers who have attempted in philosophy or romance to establish the feasibility of an ideal commonwealth, have largely drawn their inspiration, if not their ideas, from Plato. In considering the history of the Socialist Idea, therefore, it is of first importance to consider some of his views and teachings.

Plato regarded society as a self-conscious thing, capable of controlling its own form and process. He had the utmost confidence in the wisdom of the composite mind. He believed that it was only necessary to perfect the machinery of society in order to make the members of society perfect. Hence, in his ideal commonwealth, the life of the individual is absorbed in the life of the social being, and the former is regulated and determined by the latter. This applies to every detail of life. Beginning with the new-born babe, which Plato would take from the mother's breast to deliver into the hands of public nurses, and continuing throughout life, each person in his *Republic* has his manners, his tastes, his habits, his education, his work, his pleasures dictated by the "governors" of society. Property is held in common; women are known in common; everything is enjoyed in common in his ideal commonwealth. The government is conducted by philosophers, who are specially fitted and trained for this purpose. Citizens are

forbidden to trade, but required to work. Those who will not work are suffered to die, and those who cannot, are killed. The disagreeable work is done by slaves, who are usually criminals. In all occupations, women share the burden equally with men. Plato assumes that the simple fact that women bear children, while men only beget them, ought not to give rise to any greater differences between men and women than obtain between the male and the female in the animal kingdom. Hence, in his commonwealth, women are slaves, or they are governors, or they work, or they go to war the same as men.

Throughout this scheme of society there appears one dominant purpose: to prevent or to destroy the inequalities and the differences, even the distinctions, among its members. For this reason, education is universal and compulsory. It consists principally in mathematics and gymnastics, in which Plato imagines training, which all can receive, and not special talents or genius, which but few have, to be the chief desideratum. All expression of that rare sort that comes alone from genius, is discouraged as interrupting the unity and harmony of social life considered ideal. Probably he himself has given us a more illuminating description of this idea than have any among his commentators. He says (*Laws*, Bk. v): "Whether there ever will be that communion of women and children and property in which the private and individual is altogether banished from life and things which are by nature private, such as eyes and ears and hands, become common, and all men express praise and blame and feel joy and sorrow on the same occasions,—whether this is possible or not, no man acting upon any other principle will ever constitute a State more exalted in

virtue or better or truer than this." This passage fairly epitomises Book IV of the *Republic*, in which Plato, with much circumlocution, affirms that society is an organism instead of an organization, bearing analogy to the human organism, and as such capable of being developed and controlled as a single person. It is upon this theory, perhaps most fully stated in the *Republic*, but also suggested in other of his works (*Crito*, *Phaedo*, and *Protagoras*), that the charge of pantheism against Plato largely rests. It is probable that he conceived of the immortality of the soul only in the sense of its being a part of the Universal Man.

The theory that society is an organism plays a large part in Socialist literature. It is used to support the imaginative assumption, advanced as history, that the original state of society was communal, that in the dim, unwritten past, which is referred to by Bax as the "Society of Kinship," the members of the social body were not conscious of individual existence, but acted much as the cells of the human body act, unconsciously and unerringly responding to the needs of the composite being.¹ It is used also to shadow forth a vague outline of the state of society as it would be in Socialisdom, when the public mind would be an all-compelling force that the stoutest resolution of the individual could not resist.²

It should be stated, however, that Plato admitted the impracticability of his ideal commonwealth until mankind had been literally regenerated.³ In fact, it has

¹ *Ethics of Socialism*, Bax, 9 sqq.

² *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History*, 188.

³ Cf. *Republic*, Book IX and *Laws*, Book V.

been suggested more than once that the *Republic* is intended to describe a state of life after death, and in this sense it may be said to have largely inspired St. Augustine's *City of God*. It is a striking fact that in his *Laws*, written many years after the *Republic*, Plato omits many features included in his former work. Notable among these omissions is that of the provision for community of women and children, which, so far from being advocated in the crowning effort of his mature years, is emphatically condemned.⁴ In his *Statesman* also are to be observed marked indications that the views set out in the *Republic* were not in every particular the result of mature deliberation, and certainly were expressed without any hope of their being put into practice by human beings as known to Plato.

It is probable, therefore, that Aristotle's views⁵ present a contrast to those of Plato that is more seeming than real. Plato appears to us as a dreamer; Aristotle as one having a grasp of practical affairs. Both men were philosophers of the rarest type, but one was pre-eminently the artist and the other pre-eminently the statesman. Plato thought of man and his surroundings as he conceived they ought to be; Aristotle, as he observed them actually to be. Hence, in the writings of these two great thinkers who have left their impress upon the entire field of thought, there is a marked divergence of expression,—the same that is to be noted in every period as existing between the radical and the conservative, the revolutionist and the reformer.

Aristotle may be taken as the prototype of reformers.

⁴ *Laws*, Bk. VII.

⁵ *Politics*, ii, iii.

He considered governments as they were; reviewed their history, analysed their constitutions, studied their laws. He considered men as they were; studied their past, present, local, and general, individual and social habits, customs, morals, aspirations, predilections, and propensities. He was perhaps the most critical and the most profound student of men and society who ever wrote. It is peculiarly striking that he did not propose a new society. He pointed out many defects in the constitutions of States and many shortcomings in the characters of men; he was unsparing in his reproaches and condemnations. But he did not propose to destroy existing society because of the weaknesses or the evils attendant on its structure or its membership. His suggested method of correcting these things was to correct them and not to imagine a society where they would not exist in greater or lesser degree.

Plato, on the other hand, is the prototype of radicals. His writings evince a limited knowledge of both men and governments. He dealt chiefly with abstractions and perhaps is the greatest among dialecticians. He was just the sort of philosopher to propose an out and out new society. But Plato was not a mere dreamer. He was an idealist, but he was a thinker. As a philosopher he ranks with Aristotle, though as a student he is much the lesser of the two. His mental grasp of those faint outlines of the Ideal that eluded other minds, was strong and sure and he delighted himself and others in his mastery of them. Plain, every-day truths seemed to hold no pleasure for him. Others might concern themselves with the commonplace, but his business was to rise above all ordinary planes and teach the truths that obtained in

the region of the gods. He sought the truth, and was not in the least concerned as to whether that truth was applicable to human life or some other higher than human, just so it was true. But having no knowledge, or at least no definite knowledge, of any life higher than human life, he quite naturally tried to apply the truths he conceived to the life he knew. He failed in this, and he realized it, but he did not clearly realize why he failed. He conceived certain universal truths as undeniable and that they were not possible of application was unthinkable. But he could not apply them in the world he knew or to the beings he knew. They would not fit. Still, he knew those truths were true. His reason taught him that where private property existed, there would not be universal and perfect justice, that where "there was marriage and giving in marriage," there would not be universal and perfect love, that where there were different orders in society not based on established and recognized merit, there would not be universal and perfect peace. But what was he to do with these truths? Men had to live, and differing from mere animals, they strove to better their conditions of living. This was their deepest instinct. The next deepest was to reproduce their kind. And it was undeniable that they would take advantage of one another to indulge these natural impulses. Hence, there was need of property, of family, and of government, and these institutions precluded the possibility of universal and perfect justice, love, and peace.

Plato saw all this clearly. He tried very sincerely to reconcile this apparent conflict between truth and life. But what he could not clearly see was the certainty of a future life, where man would live without effort and

perfectly happy forever, and there would be no necessity for the instincts of self-preservation or reproduction and none for property, family or State to prevent their abusive indulgence. Considering that he wrote some four centuries before the perfect revelation of the "Word made flesh," and when the hope of "the Resurrection and the Life" was yet deeply veiled in prophecy, it is not surprising that Plato's conception of a future life was vague and uncertain, and that, confusing the natural and the supernatural, he vainly strove to fashion a commonwealth that would make a heaven of earth. With the light of revealed truth thrown upon his teachings, it is not difficult for one of far lesser attainments than Plato to detect the false ideal from the true, to determine that which is of possible accomplishment in this life and that which can be realized only in the life to come.

II. UTOPIAN

It was nearly twenty centuries from the time of Plato until Sir Thomas More wrote his *Utopia*. In the meantime the map of the civilized world had been variously changed. The great cities of the East had gone to ruin; the great empires of the West had decayed; the New World had been discovered. In the meantime, too, Christianity had arisen and spread over the world; Mohammedanism had become a power; the Crusades were finished and the Renaissance had begun; Democracy, as yet itself unknown, had given birth to the city-republics of southern Europe; Feudalism had lost its place in civilization. But in all this while the teachings of Plato had not spread. Cicero wrote his *Republic*, Augustine his *City of God*, Dante his *Monarchy*; but these ideals

of government, though they are generally classed as imitations, are so far different from Plato's conception that it is doubtful whether we owe them to him or to Aristotle. In fact, Cicero claimed that his *Republic* was written in part to preserve the ideas of a lost "Dialogue" of Aristotle (I am aware of no other classical writer who refers to this work). How much of Plutarch's *Lycurgus* was inspired by Plato, and how much is truly historical, cannot be said with assurance, but there is such a marked resemblance between the ideal commonwealth imagined by the philosopher and the social life of the Spartans described by the historian, that one cannot escape the conviction that they are related in their conception.

But whatever the source of inspiration for the writers after Plato and before More, there can be no mistaking the latter's indebtedness to the Athenian for the main outlines of *Utopia*. It supposes a like community of property and of children, though it is noteworthy that the community of women advocated by the pagan philosopher in his earlier writings is lacking in the scheme of the Christian. It divides the citizens of Utopia into three classes, which correspond to Plato's governors, workers, and slaves. It aims at the same common level among men that was thought to be ideal by Plato: "For so wise a man could not but foresee that the setting all upon a common level was the only way to make a nation happy."¹ But *Utopia* is more elaborate in detail than the *Republic*. The Utopians have their work, their rest, their enjoyments, both serious and frivolous, prescribed minutely, in time, place, and character. All citizens wear

¹ *Utopia*, 30.

the same kind of clothes, there being no difference in color, style or material; the fashion never changes; each citizen has but two suits and these are expected to wear about five years. Money is held in contempt. Gold and silver are used to make chains for criminals and slaves, and thus their use becomes degrading. There are scarcely any laws in Utopia, the magistrates passing on all matters of order and justice as they arise, making the law to fit the occasion and the offender.²

As to their trade: each city is divided in quarters and in the center of each is a market, to which each pater familias goes and "takes whatever he or his family may need, without paying anything for it or leaving anything in exchange."³ However, all citizens take their meals in common, in great halls, arranged for thirty families each. Even the manner in which they sit at table is prescribed. In fact, practically every detail of life is fixed for the Utopians, including the manner in which courtship is conducted. Yet it is said: "They are the happiest people in the world, and their commonwealth I not only think the best in the world but the only one that truly deserves the name."⁴ Later, however, the writer radically modifies this view. At the same time he says that as a whole or substantially, the society he pictures is impracticable and hopeless.⁵

The marked difference between Plato and More is in their way of presenting their ideals rather than in the ideals themselves. Plato supports his with a strong ar-

² *Utopia*, 39-44.

³ *Ib.*, 46.

⁴ *Ib.*, 95.

⁵ *Ib.*, 99.

gument; More is content with mere statements. One is a philosopher, the other a romancer. When it is objected to More's ideal "that men cannot live conveniently where all things are common; men will be slothful because there is no gain to excite them; and lawless because authority will not be respected among those that are in all things equal to one another," More has Raphael to reply: "I do not wonder that it appears so to you, but if you had been in Utopia with me, you would then confess that you had never seen a people so well constituted as they." Now, Plato would have worked out a feasible answer to this objection or else he would have ignored it altogether. More is evidently unable to meet the objection squarely (and indeed, who is able to meet it?), so his narrator assumes an air of superior understanding, shows a condescending pity for the inexperience of the objector, and blithely passes on. In this respect, More is a worthy exemplar of Socialists, who are content to make assertions without having proof, authority or a reasonable argument to advance in support of them, who decry a questioner as one "having no part in the intellectual life" and who count it "a mark of ignorance to ask for details."

Many other passages from More have a tone and evince a spirit familiar in the circles where Socialists are heard to cry out with a loud voice against the unequal distribution of goods in society and the imagined conspiracy on the part of the rich to keep the poor in poverty. "What justice is there," he asks in the last paragraph of *Utopia*, "where a goldsmith, a banker, or any other man who either does nothing at all or is employed in things that are of no use to the public,

lives in great luxury and splendor upon what is so ill-acquired, while a mean man, a carter, a smith or a ploughman, who works harder even than the beasts themselves and is employed in labor so necessary that no commonwealth could hold out a year without them,—can only earn so poor a livelihood and must lead so miserable a life that the condition of the beasts is much better than theirs?” And in another place, he says: “I can have no other notion of all the other governments that I see or know, than that they are a conspiracy of the rich who, on pretense of managing the public, only pursue their private ends and devise all the ways and arts they can find out; first, that they may without danger preserve all that they have so ill-acquired, and then that they may engage the poor to toil and labor for them at as low rates as possible.” These two paragraphs sound very like a Socialist harangue, the first suggesting the idea that class divisions and all other appointments of civilization are the result of the divisions of property, the second being an epitome of the theory of surplus value formulated by Marx, to whom, though generally accredited, it was not original.

Second only to More as an exponent of the Utopian idea, is Campanella, a Calabrian monk, who near the beginning of the seventh century wrote the *City of the Sun*. In one respect Campanella is an imitator of Plato rather than of More. His ideal commonwealth is conceived under the form of a city-State, as was Plato's. Just as the Athenian was influenced by the city form of government, which was characteristic of classic Greece, so the Italian was influenced by the city-republics,— Venice, Florence, Genoa, Pisa,— which flourished

about him. But the *City of the Sun* is plainly imitative of More in nearly all other respects. The same bold assertion, with neither argument nor apology, marks its narrative. The same social characteristics are bespoken for the members of this imaginary society as are recited by the English visionary,—they are generous, courteous, diligent, high-minded, truth-loving, noble of bearing, temperate of indulgence and of surpassing knowledge and wisdom in all worthy things. All this is affirmed to be the consequence of the common life of the people, “who are rich because they want nothing, poor because they possess nothing; and consequently they are not slaves to circumstances but circumstances serve them.” Campanella allows only four hours a day for work (*Utopia*, six); “The remaining hours are spent joyously in learning, debating, reading, reciting, writing, walking, in exercising the mind and body, and with play.” Like More, Campanella indulges a wealth of detail as to the manner of life and government in his ideal city, leaving scarcely anything to be supplied by way of narrative and assertion. He differs from More, however, in not evading, but frankly admitting that he cannot meet, certain objections. Once, after describing the traits of communal life as he imagines it, he has the interlocutor to say: “Under such circumstances no one will be willing to labor, but will expect others to work, on the fruits of whose labors he can live, as Aristotle argues against Plato.” In reply to this the narrator says: “I do not know how to deal with that argument.” It may be said in passing that this is about as good an answer as was ever yet made to Aristotle’s argument.

Bacon was a contemporary of Campanella. His *New*

Atlantis is classed among the Utopias of literature and in a few particulars is imitative of More's, but it seems rather intended to picture in detail the remarkable civilization of the "Atlantis" glimpsed by Homer and outlined by Plato. Bacon conceives a State where science has reached a dream-like perfection,—where there are great towers, miles high, from which the winds and the rains are controlled,—great lakes and fountains and chambers and gardens, in which the vigor of youth is perpetually renewed,—great furnaces that produce light and heat so that there is no diversity of day and night, or of seasons,—sound houses, in which are produced tones and harmonies of a delicacy and beauty not elsewhere known,—perfume houses, in which are multiplied enchanting strange smells and divers imitations of tastes so that they will astonish any man,—engine houses, where are prepared instruments for all sorts of motions, swifter motions than are elsewhere known, stronger and more violent, strange for equality, fineness and subtilty, some perpetual motions,—“These are among the riches of Salomon's House.” The mode of life among the New Atlanteans is not described in detail, but enough is said for us to know that they enjoy everything in common except their wives, Bacon having preserved the sanctity of family life as did More.

The writings of More, Campanella, and Bacon bear a striking similarity to each other in the brevity, simplicity and directness of their narrative. Harrington, writing some thirty years later than Bacon, presents us a work that is quite different. His *Oceana* is both copious and prolix. It is at once an argument, a criticism, a philosophical treatise, a political tract and a romance.

It is both Utopian and Platonic, the former in its conception, the latter in its content. It is distinguished by neither the genius with which More was gifted, nor the art of which Plato was consummate master, but it is a work of prodigious and painstaking labor and not lacking in graceful finish. The most delightful thing in Harrington's ideal State is the way in which Nature has smiled upon it. He describes it in the language of Pliny, in a sort of ecstasy: "O most blessed and fortunate of all countries, Oceana! how deservedly has nature with the bounties of heaven and earth endued thee! Thy ever fruitful womb not closed with ice nor dissolved by the raging sun; where Ceres and Bacchus are perpetual twins: thy woods are not the harbor of devouring beasts, nor thy continual verdure the ambush of serpents, but the food of innumerable herds and flocks presenting thee with distended dugs of golden fleeces." The people of this fair land "live in convenient plenty, and no servile condition; keep the plough in the hands of the owners and have not hirelings." The secret of their happiness lies in their plan of dividing the land, which is not held in common, nor yet free, but on conditional tenure, not unlike that which Virgil mentions in the *Georgics* as obtaining among some ancient Roman cities.

Harrington condemns the principle of government held by Aristotle (*Politics*),—that the best governed society is that governed by the best laws; also, that of Machiavelli (*The Prince*),—that it is that governed by the best men; also, that of Hobbes (*Leviathan*),—that it is that governed by the greatest majority. He maintains that the secret of the best government lies in the balance of property, especially landed property. He may be said

to have vaguely suggested Wallace's scheme of "Land Nationalization" and George's "Single Tax" theory, which attracted such wide attention in England and America during the last century. This was a departure from the strictly communal idea held by his Utopian predecessors and is perhaps the first hint of a socialistic as distinguished from a communistic society. But it was only a hint and but feebly foreshadows the Socialist Idea as suggested by Morelly, developed by Mably, constructed into a system by Saint-Simon and Fourier, and finally reduced to a "science" by Marx and Engels.

The Socialist Idea, as an ideal, does not involve communal life, nor even community of goods. In fact, it is not compatible with community of goods in general. It requires that the producer receive all that he produces, which could not be where there is community of goods. It is rooted in the theory of "surplus-value" commonly accredited to Marx, who used this phrase to describe the part of the product that goes to non-producers in society. Certain passages of *Utopia* are suggestive of this theory, but none of its provisions are aimed to give the producer the whole product. Such an aim could not be reconciled with the ideal spirit in which Utopia was conceived. This ideal called for the same high degree of happiness for all persons, an impossible thing where the producers, to the exclusion of all others, claim the whole product of society. Hence, the suggestions of Harrington to the effect that not all property, but only landed property be held in common, is a distinctive departure from the Utopian ideal. Morelly enlarged upon this suggestion; first, as a poet, in his heroic *Basiliade*; but later as a critic, in his dogmatic *Code de la Nature*.

His fellow-countrymen, Mably, Boissel, Babeuf, Blanc, Cabet, Saint-Simon, Fourier, continued to enlarge upon it, until about the middle of the following century, when Rodbertus, Marx, and Engels gave it its "scientific" aspect. At the same time, in England, Godwin, Hall, Thompson, Owen, not to mention the Ricardian school which denounced competition, were constructing the fundamentals of this idea into a system not unlike that of Morelly and his disciples. Thompson, in particular, in his *Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth*, outlined the several economic theories that together with Morelly's teachings formed the basis upon which the accredited founders of Scientific Socialism built their system, the central idea of which is the curious contradiction of communism and property,—communism in the means for production, property in the product (the contradiction arises from the fact that the means for production usually themselves are products).

III. "SCIENTIFIC"

It is a far cry from Utopianism to Scientific Socialism, so-called. Between More and his imitators, and Marx and his followers, there is so much difference, both substantive and formal, that but for the impression usually sought to be made by the latter that their teachings are the scientific development of the ideals of the former, it would never occur to any one to connect them in a way that suggests historical sequence. And the connection here made would be misleading if some of the particulars making up this difference were not noted.

More did not entertain a hope that his ideals would ever be realized in human society; they were frankly

visionary and intended as a criticism of existing society rather than as proposals for a new order. But Marx confidently expected the realization of his schemes and proposed them as practical aims to be definitely accomplished; he even claimed that their accomplishment is absolutely inevitable. More was deeply religious. In his ideal commonwealth, while there is the utmost tolerance shown for the beliefs of all who believe in God, there is no room for the unbeliever, and whoever denies or doubts God is banished from the realm. Marx hated religion in all its forms. God he called a "fetich," and in his conception of the universe "there is absolutely no room for a Supreme Being;— even to talk of one is an insult to a man of intelligence." More's ideal of social life involves the regulation and control of individual life in practically all of its details. Utopians engage in like pursuits and pleasures, wear a common dress, eat at a public table, have common work and common hours for work, are reared in common nurseries, taught in common schools. In fine, with the exception of not having wives in common, they live under a most radical communist régime. All of this was intolerable to Marx. It bespeaks a fettering of individual freedom wholly foreign to his proposals, which would extend to all persons alike not only the fullest liberty, but also the greatest license. The only regulations of social life that Marx proposes are in the way of administering business affairs. He would abrogate all laws except the law that each must work, but that would apply for only a few hours a day, and these would be gradually reduced to a few minutes, and finally, when the work of the world is done "by the touch of a button," even work would be

dispensed with and men would be as free as animals in a herd. Even the marriage relation, which Marx pretended to regard as an impediment and a challenge to right living, would no longer exist to restrain the free exercise of men's animal desires.

Like More, Marx was gifted with imaginative genius. He indulged this faculty, however, to construct a system of philosophy and not a society, although his system comprehends nearly all phases of social thought and activity. Marx had read widely. He wrote copiously. He left a characteristic if not an original impress upon varied and numerous subjects. As a "discoverer" of principles, he has been accorded far too great credit by his admiring followers. He drew his theory of value from Ricardo's *Principles*, that of surplus-value from Godwin's *Political Justice*, that of the class-struggle from Thompson's *Inquiry*. Hegel preceded him as a dialectician, Feuerbach as a materialist, Lamarck as an evolutionist, Helvetius as a determinist.

But Marx, aided by his friend, Engels, gathered their various views together and worked them into a curious sort of unity. He incorporated the Right to Subsistence with them. This was a right advocated by all of the Utopians. It had also been frequently advanced, as it is nowadays, by practical statesmen as a reform measure highly proper to be introduced into existing society, and the Elizabethan Poor Laws, necessitated through the wholesale destruction, by Henry VIII, of monastic institutions, which were the unfailing succor of the poor, went a long way toward establishing this right. Marx also incorporated into his system the Right to Labor. Before the Reformation had weakened the re-

ligious bond that was their chief strength, the Craft Guilds, which in the Middle Ages abounded throughout Europe, had secured this right; but with the decline of the Guilds and the consequent demoralization of labor as a social force, the demand for the Right to Labor sprang up in every country where the evil of unemployment appeared. It was among the principal demands of the French Revolution and resulted in the Right being set out in the French Code of 1793, and finally in the establishment, in 1848, of the national work-shops which, because of their ill-success, are so conspicuous in the industrial history of France. The Right to the Whole Produce of Labor, first advocated by Godwin in connection with his exposition of the source of profit, which suggested to Marx the surplus-value theory, was also included in the conglomerate system accredited to Marx and Engels.

For his political theories, Marx drew variously from monarchists like Machiavelli, democrats like Rousseau, and anarchists like Proudhon. He combined the extreme Individualism of which Herbert Spencer is the classical exponent with the other extreme reached by that school of German philosophers who press the analogy suggested by Plato to its final conclusion and teach that society is an organism and its individual members are only cell-like parts that have neither consciousness nor will, except as these are derived from the whole. His theory of historical interpretation is an exaggerated development of Montesquieu's attempt to explain social progress in terms of physical geography and material environment. His cosmic theory was drawn from D'Holbach, who probably derived it from Democritus, an ob-

scure ancient. Even his sweeping attack upon God and religion was not new. Meslier, Volney, and Voltaire, not to mention others among the Encyclopedists of the eighteenth century, were distinguished for their hatred of all things sacred, but they are fairly outdone by Marx in the general sweep and bitterness of his assault.

In fine, while it would be tedious to mention his many predecessors in thought, Marx is without title of originality for any of his fundamental theories. But it is noteworthy that Marx is held out as the "discoverer" of his theories. Upon this ground a rather amusing dispute occurred between Marx and Rodbertus. Rodbertus claimed to be the discoverer of the theory of surplus-value and openly charged Marx with having pirated the idea from him, which, of course, Marx denied. "The truth is," says Mengel in his scholarly and critical work on *The Right to the Whole Produce of Labor*, "that both Rodbertus and Marx are indebted to older Socialists for their views. Their dispute as to priority, which is not without its comic element, could never have arisen, had not both with equal care refrained from confiding the sources of their views to the public."

The fact that Marx and Engels are generally regarded by Socialists as the founders of Scientific Socialism while those from whom they drew their teachings are almost forgotten, is accounted for by the difference in their methods of propaganda. The older Socialists appealed to the cultured and well-to-do classes. It is said that Fourier, at a certain hour each day for the last ten years of his life, went to his house expressly to meet some millionaire whom he expected to come forward for the purpose of establishing a "Phalanstery." Saint-

Simon was of the nobility and appealed to that class in his writings. Owen directed his appeals to the great manufacturers and bankers and was not reluctant to call upon the royalty of Europe to assist in the industrial reforms he proposed. Cabet gathered his intrepid band of Icarians from among the educated classes of the Continent. Morelly in France and Thompson in England addressed their writings to the most enlightened, not to say the most affluent, classes of their time. The classes to which these older Socialists appealed did not respond. They were not greatly impressed with the doctrines and teachings set out. As a consequence, except as to those whose names are connected with some experimental movement that is conspicuous in Socialist history for its disastrous results, these older Socialist writers have fallen into oblivion.

Marx and Engels adopted a different tactic. They appealed to the propertyless classes of society, which were almost wholly without education and practically incapable of thinking with continuity and precision or without prejudice and passion. Strange to say, the sanction of their teachings by these classes was by Marx and Engels deemed to be a true, if not an infallible, test of their vitality and verity. In consequence, these writers have become more conspicuous with the growth of the proletarian agitation and are to-day recognized as the foremost of all Socialist authorities; their writings are called "the classics of Socialist literature," and it is claimed that they have been translated into nearly every civilized tongue. The *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital* are respectively referred to by Socialists as the Magna Charta and the Bible of the working classes, and there are those

among his ardent disciples who laud Marx as a modern Christ! All of which would greatly mystify one who failed to consider the well-directed play for popular favor that Marx and Engels so cleverly injected into their teaching.

The adoption of this tactic brought a new element into the Socialist Idea; namely, Revolution. Rather, it gave to the revolutionary element already existing a new meaning. The idea of the older Socialists, and of Utopians, even of Plato, was revolutionary in as far as it contemplated a new order of society. But the new order contemplated by them was to be established through the consent of those who were to live by it, just as it is said to have been done in the case of the commonwealth of Lycurgus. The revolutionary character of Scientific Socialism is far different; it requires the triumph of the working class over the capitalist class; it means stripping the rich of their possessions by force. The classes to which Marx and Engels appealed were at once propertyless, uneducated, and lacking in political power, prerogative, and expedient. The only weapon within the reach of those classes was force. They had sufficient numbers to be effective in a fight, provided all would fight. Hence, the closing lines of the Manifesto call on the workingmen of all countries to unite, and in order to stir them to take this step, it adds the desperate sentiment: "You have nothing to lose but your chains! You have the world to gain!"

But the writings of Marx and Engels were read by others than those to whom they were directly addressed, and as a consequence, their teachings met with sharp and forcible disapproval even from sympathetic critics.

The theories of value and surplus-value, as drawn out by them to their full meaning, their "Explanation of Financial Crises," their prophecy of the "Concentration of Wealth," their cry of "Increasing Misery" and their warning of a "Final Catastrophe," were each so conclusively disproved by such men as Schäffle, Ely, Hyndman, Böhm-Bawerk, and Bernstein, to say nothing of more recent writers like Mallock, Cathrein, Ming, Ryan,—that Socialists split into two schools, distinguished as Marxians and Revisionists, each of which claims to represent Scientific Socialism.

Revisionism dates from near the close of the last century, when the German Socialist Bernstein published a series of articles attacking the fundamentals of the Marxian teachings. This series was later published in book form as *Evolutionary Socialism*. It is directed principally against the doctrine of economic determinism and its companion doctrine of class antagonism, but it also exposes the fallacy of Marx's ideas of the concentration of industry, recurrent crises, increasing misery and final catastrophe. Time was of great assistance to the Revisionists in demonstrating these fallacies. For the time tacitly fixed by the Marxians when the evils afflicting society in consequence of the capitalist system would culminate in a universal crisis that would crumble the foundations of the present order, was past and gone when the Revisionists began seriously to threaten the integrity of Socialism as conceived by Marx and Engels.

The tendency of the Socialist Idea of the present time is toward the Revisionist teaching. The term scientific is still employed, by both Marxians and Revisionists, but

the latter do not use it in its former sense, *i.e.*, as denoting that the coming of Socialism is inevitable. An entirely new society is still the aim of Socialists, Marxian and Revisionist, but with the passing of Marx, Engels, Lassalle, Liebknecht, Vandervelde, Bebel, and other forcible leaders whose revolutionary agitation made them conspicuous, the old idea that was called "scientific," though still retained in Socialist propaganda, has largely given way before that which calls for another term, such as "practical."

IV. PRACTICAL

As descriptive of a distinctive phase of their teachings, Socialists do not employ the term practical. They prefer to regard Scientific Socialism as practical. This is true even of such Socialists as Hyndman and Wells, of England; Guesde and Jaures, of France; Hillquit and Spargo, of America, to mention only these, who do not unreservedly subscribe to the Scientific Idea. But as a matter of historical precision, some distinctive term must be employed to differentiate the Socialist Idea as it obtained from the middle of the last century, or from the writing of the Communist Manifesto, in 1847, and as it has come to be more and more widely advanced since the beginning of the present century. It is only for this purpose and in this sense that the term practical is here used.

The Revisionists rejected many of the fundamentals of the Scientific Idea. But this was not sufficient to meet the growing demands of the last two decades, which have been rather for reform than for revolution. Bernstein's disciples only perceived that the Marxian ap-

praisal of industrial tendencies was false, that the growth of small tradesmen kept pace with the growth of capital, the increase of small capitalists with the increase of wealth, the comforts of the working classes with the general advancement of society, all of which Marx said was impossible. But the first Revisionists did no more than reject the Marxian forecasts. This emasculated Socialism, however, and something more was necessary, some practical measures must be adopted, if the Socialist movement was not to stop. Hence, arose that school of Socialists known as Opportunists, who, as their name implies, were ready to incorporate in their teaching any measures calculated to keep their movement going, to adopt any principle or any policy that appeared "opportune."

The Opportunists, therefore, engrafted on the Socialist Idea several measures of which the older Socialists did not dream, and several which they had emphatically repudiated, and several which they had tolerated only as temporary expedients and without any pretense of making them a part of Socialist teaching. Among the first class is the modification of the strict communism originally (and as a logical consequence, yet) required in means for production, the modification being to exclude "small farmers, small traders, artists, craftsmen, etc.," from the general rule and permit them to own and operate their property to the exclusion of society; also, in this class, are the measures looking to the whole society's owning only what things the whole society uses, while smaller divisions of society, like States and municipalities, would own things to the exclusion of the whole, and yet smaller divisions would own other things

to the exclusion of the larger, and so forth, until the small farmer, small trader, and their kind would individually own things to the exclusion of all others. Marx and Engels would certainly never recognize these offshoots of Socialism. Among the second class mentioned are all those measures looking to the betterment of the working classes, such as shorter hours, higher wages, exclusion of child labor, and restriction of female labor, provisions for safety appliances, and more sanitary conditions in working places, even minimum wage laws, industrial insurance, old-age pensions, and so forth. All such measures were consistently rejected by the older Socialists because, if adopted, they would tend to check the "increasing misery" of the working classes and to postpone the "final catastrophe" which these classes, made desperate by unmitigated oppression, would some fine day bring about, and as a consequence of which Socialism would be set up "while you wait." Among the measures that the older Socialists adopted as mere temporary expedients, but which many nowadays regard as an integral part of the Socialist Idea, are the demands for greater freedom of speech and of the press, for the free administration of justice, for universal suffrage, for the abolition of national armaments, and others.

In as far as there is a Socialist Idea nowadays, these and numerous other elements belong to it. While all Socialists, or for that matter a majority, are not in agreement as to any one of these measures, some Socialists advocate one or another of them and those who hold one and reject others claim to be as orthodox as, or more so than, others who hold the others and reject the one. Truth to say, what is here termed Practical Socialism,

has no Idea. It has no governing principle to which all who avow themselves Socialists are willing to subscribe. As the Platonic idea was lost with the advent of Christianity, which showed its essential truths to be applicable only in that future life for which this present life is but a preparation; as the Utopian idea was emasculated by the breaking up of Feudalism and Centralization in Europe, the discovery of new continents, the expansion of trade and industry, the shift of population, the growth of democracy and the general spread of civilization; so the Scientific idea began to die when the readjustment of these movements set in and the governments of the world settled down to the business of government and began to protect the weak from the strong and to secure life, liberty, and property to all citizens, as governments are intended to do. The only element remaining to hold Socialism intact is its Sentiment. Its principles fly apart like grains of sand. Its disciples war and clash in their views and opinions and in their interests. They are united by their Sentiment alone. This alone brings them together into organizations, prompts them to make demands that they do not all advocate and to enunciate teachings that they do not all believe.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SENTIMENT

“Workingmen of the world, unite! you have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain!” The sentiment expressed in these closing lines of the Communist Manifesto is the aggregate of several human passions. The growth of these passions from individual impulses into social forces is a most interesting phase of modern history. From the time of the famous Enclosure Acts, which reduced great numbers of the English people to the direst straits by depriving them of the “commons” where they lived,—the leading event among those that brought forth *Utopia*,—this growth is both marked and constant. About the time of the Enclosures came the breaking up of the Craft Guilds, and this set another class adrift and gave the growth of these passions more impetus. The destruction of the monasteries was an additional factor; it made more rapid the disintegration of the Guilds and more wretched the condition of the dispossessed “commoners.”

The art of printing was a powerful auxiliary of the expanding forces thus loosed. By this means the growing passions were communicated with great facility and kindred spirits far removed by distance were brought together in thought and feeling. The dissatisfied, the dis-

contented, the oppressed, the envious, the lawless, and the depraved, united in a common complaint that waxed strong with agitation, which was carried on boldly in spite of kings and rulers who, though they might silence the voice, could not stay the pen. *Utopia*, intended as a satire on certain English institutions and customs, as a scathing criticism of England's wealthy classes and certain of her nobles, was not permitted to appear in More's own country; but it was freely published on the Continent. *The City of the Sun* could not be published in Italy on account of the royal disfavor it excited by its thinly veiled criticism of Italian traditions and institutions; but it appeared in England without question.

Thus the philosophy of discontent spread everywhere in spite of all opposition. Doubtless its spread was more rapid because of opposition. There seems to be something strangely appealing to mankind in the writings of one suffering, whether justly or not, from the iron hand of the law,—as though sympathy with the misfortune of a writer could make the false to be true or the true to be more true. *Pilgrim's Progress* enjoyed a long reign in the hearts of the English people for scarce any other reason than that Bunyan wrote it during his long imprisonment. The classic writings of Chateaubriand were practically ignored by the French until his exile had made of him a pathetic figure. In Italy, Tasso was dearer to the people than Dante as long as his great epic was associated with the seven years' confinement of the author, during which it was published and at first mistakenly thought to have been written.

In the spread of the philosophy of discontent, this appealing note is especially manifest. More lost his head

through the disfavor of royalty; Bacon suffered many years of imprisonment; Campanella, after nearly a quarter century's confinement, was only saved from death through the intervention of a Pope; Harrington barely escaped the sword that fell upon Charles I, and after the Restoration his plight was scarce better, and he died in prison. The ideal commonwealths left by these philosophical romancers, all except More's, were conceived in the shadow of their great misfortunes. They passed on to other generations with the memory of those misfortunes clinging to them. And this memory mingles its gripping pathos with the sufferings of like philosophers or romancers of other generations. Morely died in exile; Babeuf suffered the confiscation of his property and committed suicide to escape execution; Krapotkin, Proudhon, Marx, Engels, Lassalle, wrote in exile or in prison.

In fine, all the philosophers of Discontent, whose writings have stirred the sympathies of the masses, have set out their pessimistic views of society amid surroundings and after experiences that had for them so little of promise in life that their teachings seem to all discontented spirits to ring true and they strike conviction into the hearts of those whose sympathies outrun their understanding, as well as those whose fear and distrust outweigh their hope and confidence of society in general and of government in particular.

The art of printing served not only to circulate the expression of discontent but also to preserve all such expressions as they accumulated, and thus there came about a very literature of Discontent in which were gathered together the oppressions and cruelties and wrongs and

wrecks of nations to excuse, justify, extol, ennoble this attitude of mind.

But notwithstanding these many causes tending to develop discontent from an individual impulse into a social force, there remained until the middle of the eighteenth century a powerful restraint to its full development. That restraint was the Christian religion, whose philosophy is the direct antithesis of the philosophy of Discontent. "Whenever one desires anything inordinately," wrote the illustrious Thomas à Kempis, "straightway is he disquieted in his heart." And conversely, a disquietude of the heart signifies an inordinate desire, which is contrary to Christian teaching. Hence, so long as Christianity held sway in the hearts of men, the philosophy of Discontent could not secure a marked degree of recognition.

But the radicalism of the eighteenth century did much to undermine the dominant influence of the teachings of Christ. Diderot, Condillac, Condorcet, Linguet, may be taken as typical exponents of the extreme radical school in France; Locke, Hobbes, Hume, are the leading types of this school in England; D'Holbach, Feuerbach, Hegel, Kant, have an equally questionable distinction as to Germany. The names of these writers had become household words by the time of the French Revolution, to bring about which their teachings most of all things contributed. Those teachings, profoundly pessimistic, frankly revolutionary, attacking Church, State, Property, Family, were emphatically at war with Christianity at every point. They were writ in the vernacular, freely circulated and widely read. It is said that Voltaire's writings, in which he attacked Christian ideals with

malign hatred, became so popular that twelve editions were exhausted within five years. In fine, Christianity momentarily lost its place in the hearts of the masses who yielded to the self-imposed tutorship of these rabid teachers. Its place in the universities had already been filled by them, while the masses were yet illiterate or unread, and hence, when their poisonous doctrines began to be disseminated, there were none effectively to warn the unsuspecting people of their deadly character.

As a consequence of this change in the perspective opened up before them, the people generally put no restraint upon their passions. Whatever they desired, they desired "inordinately" and without recognizing any restraint other than the purely physical. The Revolution was the climax. It was simply the putting into practice of the philosophy of Discontent, which the masses had learned and which they were not content to regard as mere theory, but intent on making a rule of action. The Revolution failed, but the social force of which it was the expression was not sensibly weakened. It failed, not because its spirit had been subdued by Christian teaching, nor yet because the social injustice that had immediately provoked it had been abrogated; it failed because of the blind passion that brought it on, the passion of Discontent, which fired the revolutionists with the spirit of revolt against the old order and consumed them with lust in the order that was established upon the ruins of the old. The philosophy of Discontent inevitably produces failure wherever it is applied. It does not admit of contentment with success even, but drives forward its votaries like a mad god drunken with

his own spirit of raging, rampant, desperate discontent. And when, through sheer physical exhaustion as it were, these votaries halt, whether defeated or triumphant, they are discontented still, pitiful alike in their success and in their failure, a sad commentary on the folly of mankind in forgetting its own limitations and turning against the God of providences.

Failing as it did,—because its violent fires burnt it out,—the Revolution, which had separated the people if possible all the further from God and religion, instead of crushing the spirit of discontent in the human heart implanted it there all the more firmly, ready to break forth in repeated revolts when opportunity should come, as it did.

This illustrates the peculiar quality of religion as a civilizing force. Religion lays its grip upon the little monster of evil desire before it issues forth from its secret den in the human heart, and the monster is strangled to death before it is fairly alive. Civil power, however mighty, must suffer the monster to grow in the heart, and to breed there, and cannot reach it until it issues forth to begin its work of havoc. And by the time civil power is able to crush the full-grown monster, if it ever is, the brood that it has engendered in the heart is ready to come forth for more destruction.

So, when the reign of blood begun by the Revolution was terminated by the rule of iron set up by the "Little Corporal," only the one big dragon at large was crushed and those hidden in the secret recesses of the hearts of revolutionists continued to grow. They broke forth again when the Corsican fell, again in 1830, again in 1848, again in the Paris Commune, and again and

again,— under different forms, upon different pretenses, with momentarily different aims, but having the same desperate discontent driving them on. Instead of becoming weaker, this terrible social force seems to have become stronger after the Revolution. It became allied in that great upheaval with Envy and Lawlessness, and this alliance has not been broken since.

Envy and Lawlessness, like Discontent, have always existed here and there among men. But before the Revolution they were never so widespread, so uniform in a class, as to be called a social phenomenon. They reached this proportion during the Revolution, or as an immediate result of it. Through its wholesale confiscations and robberies and its divisions of property among the Sansculottes, the Revolution gave to the discontented masses just that taste of the pleasures of wealth that provokes envy, and thereafter the discontent of those indulged was deeply embittered by the contemplation of the things that others enjoyed. At the same time, the Revolution had perpetrated all manner of crime in the name of the law. In fact, it made crime lawful and not only protected but even honored the most guilty and the most abhorrent criminals. Hence, many came to believe that law is only an instrument in the hands of those in power, to be used generally for their pleasure, but especially to protect them while they commit outrages upon the rest of mankind. With the growth of this belief, lawlessness developed into a social force.

Discontent, envy and lawlessness, therefore, are to be considered together as the social heritage of civilization from the radicalism of the eighteenth century culminating in the storm and wreckage of "Ninety-three."

There is another passion included in the Socialist Sentiment that is seriously to be reckoned with. Though it did not develop into a social force during the Revolution, nor for some time afterwards, the cause, or at least the occasion, of its development is rooted in that dreadful occurrence. This is the passion of Greed. As a passion common to a class, Greed is a modern social phenomenon. At different periods in the past there have been various passions so common to a class or a people as to be a social phenomenon. At one time this passion was to build great monuments, as among the Egyptians; at another to develop perfect physical manhood, as among the Spartans; at another to perfect the arts and sciences, as among the Athenians. The Hebrews had a passion for religion, the Romans for law, the Mohammedans for power. Once the passion for royalty was dominant, then that for chivalry, then that for liberty.

These are not progressive in their order. An advanced civilization is often characterized by a passion that was dominant in a more barbaric age. The modern fad masquerading under the pedantic name of Eugenics was no less a fad in the time of Lycurgus. We moderns, too, show an inclination toward monument building. The English are no less noted for their love for law than were the Romans. The passion for free love is not new.

But before the French Revolution, Greed is not observed as having been a characteristic passion of any people or class of people. In Medieval Europe there were the Crusades, the Renaissance, the Reformation, and then came the passion for Revolution, but there was

no evidence yet of the passion of Greed. The Revolution gave an entirely new direction to the march of civilization. It crippled the force of religion, crushed the power of royalty, swept away the old traditions and the established laws and tried to level down the inequalities among men by closing all avenues to distinction that had formerly existed. It accomplished this temporarily by force and then sought to secure it permanently by legislation. The result was natural enough, though it was not, perhaps could not have been, foreseen. Cut off from all other means of rising to a superior position, men of superior ability bent their energies to accumulating wealth, and then more wealth, and the desire for wealth became a passion that expanded and grew until it gripped whole classes in its toils with that absorbing tenacity with which it had formerly taken hold of the isolated and outcast Jew. The grip of this passion on modern classes was more intense and more deadly than ever it was on the Jew. The Jew never quite forgot his religion, though he did not apply it strictly in his dealings with a people that despised him. He never regarded money as altogether the most precious thing on earth or in heaven, but only on earth. But those who imbibed the spirit of the Revolution made no exception; having come to disregard heaven, they held money as the most precious thing anywhere. With them the passion of greed became an all-consuming one. Rooted in discontent, embittered with envy, hateful of all restraint, brooking no law and no authority, this passion drove its victims to the most desperate issues with social institutions, which alone, since religion had come to be despised, could protect the Haves from the Have-Nots.

Before the time of Marx and Engels, the alliance of Discontent, Envy, Lawlessness, and Greed was spontaneous rather than studied, a sort of natural association of kindred spirits instead of a conscious effort toward organization. The discontented freely circulated their pessimistic views, the envious read them with sympathetic approval, the lawless frankly took occasion to put them into practice, the greedy sought by every means to turn them to profit. But there was not among these that concert of action or of thought that is essential to growth along definite lines. There was not that "class-consciousness" which Socialists so much rely upon to unite all the jarring social factions into a single class having the determined purpose to destroy society and raise itself up on the ruins.

Marx and Engels endeavored to bring about this singleness of purpose. In the frankest of revolutionary terms they appealed to all the malcontents of society to organize upon a world-wide scale for purposes of direct and wholesale destruction. They laid emphasis upon the necessity as well as the propriety for such organization by "scientifically" pointing out how there existed among other classes what they termed a "gigantic conspiracy deliberately and systematically to rob and keep in subjection for the purpose of increasing their power to rob the working classes," which were the classes to whom these self-inspired prophets appealed. They pretended to see no other purpose in religion than to further this conspiracy by preaching up the virtues of poverty, humility, obedience, self-denial, in order to persuade its victims to submit graciously to being robbed. They pretended to see no other object in government and law

than to carry out this conspiracy by forcible means whenever religion should fail in its persuasive tactics. They held the right of property to be unnatural and wrong and as having been foisted upon society through this conspiracy in order to secure to the possessing classes under the sanction of religion and the State, the spoils accumulated through exploitation and robbery. They regarded the monogamous institution of the family in the light of this conspiracy and as a part of it, intended to perpetuate to their known offspring the holdings of the possessing classes. They claimed to have sounded the depths of the motive for all human action and found it to be a desire to increase or control the food supply. On account of this "discovery" they re-wrote the history of the world in such a way as to persuade all who were predisposed to believe it, that since the first divisions of property into "mine" and "thine," society has been divided into two great classes, the Haves and the Have-Nots, and between these there has always been and must always be a deadly struggle going on. The Haves are few in number, and growing fewer; the Have-Nots are a multitude, and increasing. The former triumph over the latter and rob them because they are organized and bent on a common purpose and make use of all existing institutions, while the latter, unconscious of their numbers and power, and indifferent to their *class* interests, quietly submit.

All this is clearly and forcibly set out in the famous Manifesto of Marx and Engels, which closes with the dramatic appeal to the workingmen of the world to unite their great numbers into a class-conscious organization that will rise up against society in force and without

fear, inspired by the desperate thought that they have the world to gain and nothing to lose but their chains.

In keeping with the spirit of the time (1848), the uprising called for by the Manifesto was called a Revolution, and was said to be distinguished from previous revolutionary movements only by its economic and "class-conscious" aspects, its international scope and its "scientific" character. In reality it was a destructive movement. No new society was proposed. No law or social institution, existing or imagined, was pointed out as fitting. The immediate aim was to destroy; the ultimate, to let come what might come. Only a single thought was given to the future,—the destroyers would own the world. Should it prove too much for them, they would be none the worse off for that,—they have nothing but chains to lose. The idea reminds one of the fantastic notion of Falstaff, who didn't think any sort of wrong would hurt him if he gained the world by doing it, since then the world would be his and he could right the wrong to suit himself.

The Nihilism thus brought into alliance with the other passions that form the Socialist Sentiment, itself included a whole array of minor passions. Chief among these were those expressed in atheism, anarchy, confiscation, and free-love, aimed against religion, State, property and family. Atheism had been spreading for a century before Marx's time, and during his day was the vogue among the "Intellectuals" of Europe. The last half century, in which throughout Europe there were some hundreds of revolutions more or less notable, had made anarchy popular among certain classes. The wholesale confiscations of property during that unsettled period had

developed a passion for this practice that only needed favorable opportunity to be vented on a much larger scale than ever before. The revival of the ancient bill of divorce, which seems always to come about when "hearts are hardened," had given to lustful natures a taste of freedom from the restraints imposed by monogamous marriage, and in certain circles this grew into a passion which demanded the abrogation of the marriage relation. Into this poisoned atmosphere came the Manifesto, with its clarion-like call to organize all the discordant elements of society into a single force. It pretended to be based on science. It pretended to breathe a spirit of sympathy for the unfortunate and the oppressed. Both claims were false, but the classes to which they were addressed were both unwilling and unable to test their verity. These classes almost eagerly answered the call. They gathered together like so many forces of destruction and the passion of Nihilism appeared as a new social phenomenon and was allied with Discontent, Envy, Lawlessness, and Greed to round out to completion the Socialist Sentiment.

In the progress of the Socialist movement, its original sentiment has not changed with time or place. It is everywhere seen to embody the same elements, to spring from the same conditions, to represent the same passions. But in times of widespread prosperity, and in places where a large measure of civic well-being abounds, this sentiment has been overshadowed by other sentiments that, while not socialistic in their character, are held by many Socialists. Among these may be mentioned the sentiment of philanthropy, which prompts many who are sensible to the sufferings of the poor, and who mistake

the principles and the aims of Socialism, to ally themselves with the movement. The democratic sentiment prompts others to join it from the misplaced conviction that it tends toward more complete self-government. The sentiments that give rise to trade-unionism, fraternalism, co-operation, and other expressions of the growing demand for social justice, are also prolific in the way of giving birth to Socialist sympathies.

These sentiments do not belong to the Socialist Sentiment. But in order to keep the movement active during periods when, on account of general satisfaction among the masses, due to prosperous conditions, its true sentiment becomes dormant, and the Socialist appeals consequently fall on deaf ears, these sentiments are tactfully utilized by Socialist leaders and propagandists. The pretense of adopting these sentiments serves to give the movement a specious appearance of respectability and enables its apologists to appeal to well-meaning reformers at times when their revolutionary and nihilistic sentiment fails to meet with response.

Nothing is more fatal to a true perspective of Socialism than to confuse the sentiment that gave it birth, and that will give it victory, if it ever attains to victory, with the sentiments that are independent of its philosophy and its teachings. Philanthropy, democracy, trade-unionism and the like, are not infrequently found combined in organizations that are essentially anti-Socialistic, but discontent, envy, lawlessness, greed, and nihilism are not combined in anything but Socialism. As an organization, Socialism cannot claim credit for a single act of philanthropy. It has never been friendly to trade-unions as such. The absence of a fraternal spirit in its

organization is perhaps more marked than in any other organization known to history. These facts will appear more conclusively in the history of the Movement, which is to follow. They are mentioned here to emphasize the distinctive character of the Socialist Sentiment, which is an aggregate of ignoble passions which, before Marx and Engels called them together, were never united on earth.

CHAPTER THREE

THE MOVEMENT

I. FORMATIVE PERIOD

The history of the Socialist movement may be said to begin with the final stage of the French Revolution. The first stage of that revolution was marked by a kind of Constitutionalism that sharply distinguishes it from the final stage. The States-General, or French *Parlement*, was assembled in 1789. It was convoked on this occasion the first time since 1641, at the request of Necker, First Minister under Louis XVI. Necker had succeeded Turgot, the famous economist, who was retired on account of his effort to abolish certain privileges relating to tax exemptions which had long been enjoyed by the Nobles and the Clergy. Louis, by no means the least worthy of French monarchs, was in sympathy with Turgot's aim equitably to distribute the burdens of taxation, and while he seemed to yield to the pressure of the Court by dismissing him, Necker was selected with a view to his carrying through the project of his predecessor, and to this end the States-General was summoned.

This body was composed of the Nobles, the Clergy, and the Commons, or Third Estate, which was elevated to equal dignity with the two feudal orders during the twelfth century, by Louis VI. Whether the third order was entitled to a majority over the other two when as-

sembled, is a mooted question. It does not appear to have been so constituted, but it seems to have been accorded this right on occasion. However that may be, when the three assembled in '89, some six weeks were spent in fruitless discussion of this question. The Third Estate finally withdrew from the two more ancient orders and declared itself to be the National Assembly of the French people. This was the occasion for the popular uprisings that M. Taine well describes as "spontaneous anarchy." These were not so much a movement as a demonstration, not improbably intended in a way to induce the King and Court to acquiesce in the constitution of the Assembly. At least that was their effect. Within a month, in the presence of delegates from all of France, the King subscribed to the new constitution, and with that the demonstrations subsided.

This constitution deprived the Nobles and the Clergy of all privileges and of practically all power. It did not seriously impair the prerogatives of the Crown, however, and two years later the National Assembly was dissolved and its place was taken by the Legislative Assembly, whose constitution left the Monarchy but little more than a name. But even the name was too much for the restive spirit that shortly sprang up at the instigations of Danton, Robespierre, Marat, Herbert, Chaumette, who were embittered by the frequent issues of paper money that impoverished France and emboldened by the great famine and drouth that made poverty equivalent to starvation. During the year after the King had sworn to the constitution of the Legislative Assembly, which left him only a figurehead, the Republic was formally declared, September, 1792.

Events moved rapidly from this time. There was no longer any pretense of Constitutionalism. The Girondists, the Jacobins, the Herbertists, joined in the fell attack against the social order, only halting in their destruction of society long enough to fly at each other's throats. The King was beheaded in January, 1793. Marat was then accused by his lawless colleagues. Herbert fell next; and then Danton. Robespierre was now supreme. He could condemn whomsoever he would to the guillotine, and he exercised this power both in person and by proxy with a free hand. Montgaillard, the historian, estimates the victims of his atrocity by the thousands. He seems to have surrounded himself with the most depraved creatures, in order that once they had done his murderous work, he might want for no excuse to dispatch them also. Thiers says of Robespierre: "He presents himself to our contemplation as one of the most odious beings who has ever domineered over men, and we should say also, one of the most vile." It is no wonder that his multiplied barbarities palled upon the people, even though they had been athirst for blood. In July, 1794, he fell, unloved and unlamented. Tallien, Collot, and Billaud-Varennes, who finally compassed his ruin, were no less terrorists than Robespierre, but their day was shorter, for they were condemned four months later. And in less than a month afterward, the "Mountainist" leaders who had destroyed them were themselves brought to the block.

In April, 1795, occurred the "Insurrection of the Hungry," which was incited by the Thermidorians, successors to the Jacobins; and in May, that of the First Prairial, led by the successors to the Girondists. A final

insurrection occurred in October, fomented by the discontented elements left of the Jacobins, Thermidorians, Girondists, and other despairing and desperate parties of the radical revolutionary type. It was this insurrectionary movement that brought his opportunity to Napoleon. With its failure, the Terror was brought to a close, and with the Terror, the Revolution.

"One event remains to be mentioned," say the Socialist writers Morris and Bax, in their treatment of the "French Revolution — Proletarian Stage" (*Growth and Outcome of Socialism*), "the attempt of Baboeuf and his followers to get a proletarian government recognized. He and Darthes were condemned to death. Many others were condemned to prison or exile. And so ended the first Socialist propaganda." How fittingly has it been observed that the Revolution, like Saturn, produced children only to devour them!

The striking feature about the last three years of the Revolution, so aptly described by Socialists as the "Proletarian Stage," is the utter lack of constructive action. Those years saw destruction a-plenty. Religion, science, art, law, government,—all civilized institutions, were attacked with an unsparing hand. The work of many centuries was undone in those years. But nothing was *done*. Not a single permanent institution was established. Not one enduring law was made. No lasting ideal was set up. Herbert and his followers, known as "Enragés" (rabids), proclaimed the worship of Reason, but none worshipped. Robespierre instituted the Religion of the Supreme Being, but none believed. The Sansculottes were invested with property rights, but none respected them. Sunday was abolished for the "Tenth

Day Rest," but it was not noticed. The Right to Labor was declared, but nobody worked. Liberty was proclaimed, but none were free. Fraternity and Equality were assured, but men fraternized only when put in dungeons and became equal only when their heads dropped in the same basket after passing under the guillotine. Carlyle well says, though like most of his sayings this too, perhaps is tinged with irony: "The Revolution was the frightfullest thing that was ever born of Time." Socialists are not envied the consolation they feel in knowing that its most frightful aspect "represented the proletarian instinct or germ of Socialism." We are told that this instinct failed to triumph "only because the proletarians were not united, not conscious of their *class* interests, therefore they could make no head against society, which they had indeed shaken, but which they were not yet able to destroy."

During the time of Napoleon's career was not a good season for the growth of this Socialist germ. Napoleon did not consider it a very healthy germ, and from what he saw of it while it was germinating, it is not surprising that he was averse to its taking root. Not only in France, but throughout Europe, and in America, the wholesale destruction of society had ceased to be an acceptable or even a tolerable proposal. Hence, instead of agitating insurrection and revolt, Socialists began to advocate constructive experiments. In France, Saint-Simon and Fourier put forward their novel schemes for the reorganization of society. In England, Owen began his New Lanark Mills experiment. In America the Economites, who had been ridiculed out of Germany, established their Harmony Society.

The fall of Napoleon and the Restoration brought about another outburst of the proletarian instinct, little more than an incident so far as events go, but important in its bearings. The immediate cause of this petty revolt was the vote of the Chamber adopting Corvetté's financial scheme to raise the seven hundred million indemnity required of France by the Allies in the treaty of 1815. The scheme was to pledge the forest land of the clergy to raise the sum required. This had been the government's customary way of raising money since the beginning of the Revolution, when Talleyrand's proposal to issue four hundred million assignats against the church lands was adopted. Similar action afterwards was frequent, and the forest land was about all that was left of the once vast estates of the clergy. It was perfectly agreeable, therefore, so far as the irreligious masses were concerned, to take over this remnant of the clerical possessions. But Corvetté's plan included a provision to pay the clergy, not full compensation, but the sum of four millions, which though pitifully inadequate as a purchase price, was sufficient to recognize the right of property. The proletarian masses, not recognizing property rights, especially in the clergy, whom they were taught to look upon as an idle and a parasitic class, rebelled at the proposal to pay anything for the forest lands. They realized that, though the sum stipulated was but a pittance, its payment would be a step in retrenchment from the excesses of the Revolution. They became deeply incensed against the clergy on this account, held numerous assemblies, drafted petitions to the government, started riots, and planned a general insurrection. But the authorities met the situation with un-

usual dispatch. There was a reason. The Allies would hardly accept money derived from out and out confiscation; therefore, the clergy must be paid something if only to prevent the Allies from having to refuse tainted money. So this insurrection was put down before it had fairly started. It lasted but a few months and caused but little bloodshed outside of Paris. It is of no consequence in the history of France, but marks a stage in the development of the "proletarian instinct or Socialist germ."

Following this still-born insurrection there was comparative quiet among the proletarian classes of France until the revolution of 1830, which deposed Charles X and enthroned Louis Philippe. The immediate cause of this sudden outbreak was the withdrawal by Charles of a large measure of the freedom of the press that his predecessor had granted. Among the numerous uprisings, revolutions, and counter-revolutions that began in France during the century following 1789, this one of 1830 perhaps at the outset was most nearly a movement for self-government, and the freest from base and lawless passions. But this distinctive aspect did not long obtain. The revolution did not confine itself to the overthrow of a dynasty. It gave rise to pretensions and hopes that aroused the allied passions of the Socialist sentiment to activity and united all the schools and all the sects that were dreaming of new social schemes and organizations. Writing of this event in his *Memoirs*, Guizot says: "The Saint-Simonians, the Fourierists, the Socialists and the Communists, at variance with each other in principle, and unequal in strength as in intelligence, were all in a state of ambitious effervescence.

The entire government, the monarchy, the chambers, the magistracy, the administration, were attacked with undissembled violence. Their total overthrow was unreservedly proposed." In his history of the time, Alison says: "The state of the working classes, which had rapidly degenerated in consequence of the first revolution, was brought to a climax of horror by the effects of the second. They were surprised and angry to find themselves just as unhappy on the day after as on the day before the 'Great Days.' They gathered together in the streets and on the square to command (!) the government to procure for them diminution of their labor. They wanted to break the machines which they said suppressed employment." Some fifteen years previously, in England, the Luddites had carried on an organized movement for the destruction of machinery, and at the time of which Alison writes, there had just begun the English Chartist movement, of which the "Plug Riots" (so named from the practice of bursting steam boilers by pulling out the plugs), were a characteristic tactical measure.

At the same time that the proletariat of France was seeking to destroy both the machinery of government and of modern industry, this class was not idle in other countries, and there was revolutionary activity manifest in Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Poland, Hungary, and the Slavonic provinces of Austria. Germany alone seemed to be free from domestic disorder. But, strange to say, from Germany came the intellectual force that finally crystallized the general discontent into a concrete movement. If the German proletariat was slow to join in the violent demonstrations elsewhere breaking out, it

was more because of the German temperament than on account of lack of sympathy with the spirit of the times. When Rodbertus, Marx, Engels, Lassalle, had thoroughly disseminated their teachings, and the German Associations of Workingmen, organized through Lassalle's indomitable energy, had formed centers of agitation throughout the nation, Germany was ripe for violence, and the European revolutions of 1848 found her no laggard in the fray.

Rodbertus preceded Marx by some fifteen years, but it is to the latter we must credit the greatest influence in finally crystallizing into a movement the social ferment whose effervescent disturbances had marred the quiet of Europe for so many years. He was seconded in this work by Engels and Lassalle, the first his literary companion and co-worker, the second his propagandist, agitator, and organizer. Marx began his public career as an editor, in 1841. Two years later his paper was suppressed and he was compelled to leave Germany. It was then that Lassalle began his work of organizing the discontented workingmen of his country. He drew all his theories from Marx, whose writings he zealously circulated. These writings did not cease with Marx's exile, but increased instead. Marx went to Paris, and there he met Engels, and shortly afterwards the two published their first joint work, *The Holy Family*, from the Christian viewpoint a most infamous first-born. Thenceforth the writings of these two were as prolific as they were inflammatory. Their seditious character was so pronounced that Marx and Engels were expelled from France. They went to Brussels to continue their propaganda, and there, in 1847, at the request of the Com-

munist Union, drew up the famous Communist Manifesto. From Brussels, also, they were expelled, and went to Cologne, only to be again driven forth. They now took refuge in London, where they remained.

The revolutions of 1848, especially that in France, which Bradford in his *Lesson of Popular Government* says did "more than any other event in history to lower France in the estimation of the world," thoroughly aroused Continental Europe to the necessity of suppressing revolutionary societies. In consequence, their leaders everywhere suffered expulsion. London became the Mecca for these exiles and their more zealous followers who volunteered to share their lot. At the instigation of Marx, a convention of "proletarians" from all countries in Europe was called to assemble in London to discuss the project of an international union, and, as a consequence, The International Workingmen's Association was formed.

The object of this organization was to provide a Socialist world-center, from which would radiate a system of controls that would serve to bring about a universal revolution. Some sixty years of revolutionizing in Europe, during which time several hundred more or less serious revolts terminated disastrously, forced the conviction that it was futile to attempt to destroy society by intermittent and localized uprisings. At the same time, the uniform and complete failure of all experiments undertaken in the way of setting up Socialism in the midst of society, left no doubt as to the futility of attempting to establish Socialism in that manner. Clearly, society must be destroyed before Socialism would flourish. But society resisted all efforts to de-

stroy it. When the attacking forces seemed about to prevail against it in one country, the powers of another would be invoked to put those forces down, as was done in France time and again. And if the attacking forces would not down, as in the case of Poland, the powers would divide the country among themselves. Hence, the "International," to bring about the "Great Revolution" in which simultaneous uprisings in all countries would prevent them from coming to each other's assistance. With the organization of this body the formation of the Socialist movement was complete in all its elements.

II. THE "INTERNATIONAL"

Marx was the dominant figure in this organization from its beginning. Its form as well as its character was made to conform strictly to his teachings. Mazzini, the Italian revolutionist, tried to procure the adoption of a constitution not in harmony with Marx's proposals, but he failed lamentably. The constitution adopted, which was in the form of a proclamation, embodied all of the salient principles of the Manifesto written fifteen years before. It appealed to the same classes as did the Manifesto, bewailed society in the same terms, inveighed against capitalists with the same bitterness, and concluded with the famous rallying cry: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

For some seven years after its organization, the International convened almost every year, now in one country and now in another, at Geneva, Brussels, Basle, London, New York. Its first practical results are seen in the Paris Commune of 1871, the most thoroughly lawless and inexcusable uprising that perhaps ever occurred

in the world. The Franco-Prussian war left France prostrate. The indemnity required by Germany, the greatest in history, threatened to overwhelm the conquered nation. Guided by the International, the Socialists took advantage of the conditions to foment an insurrection whose aim was to destroy the remnant of the French nation, blot out her civilization, and bring into existence the first Socialist society.

Writing of this event in the 16th chapter of their *Growth of Socialism*, Morris and Bax say: "The result of the war seemed to offer at least a chance to the rapidly increasing Socialist party, if they could manage to take advantage of it. Accordingly, under the guidance of the International, the French Socialists determined to take action if an opportunity offered. Nor did the opportunity fail. In October, while the siege [the terrible siege of Paris that should have called forth the last vestige of patriotism], was still in progress, a rising headed by Blanqui nearly succeeded. . . . After the siege, the possession of arms, especially cannon, by the proletariat, in the face of the disarmed and disorganized army, afforded the opportunity desired by the Socialists. The Central Committee, largely composed of members of the International, got into their hand the executive power. Enactments of a distinctive Socialist nature were passed, involving the suspension of contract, abolition of rents, and confiscation of property. . . . The revolt was at last drowned in the blood of the workers of Paris. The immediate result was to crush Socialism for the time by the destruction of a whole generation of its most determined recruits. The fall of the Commune naturally involved that of the International. The imme-

diate failure of its action was obvious and blinded people to its indestructible principles."

Internal dissensions, which are an ever-present source of disruption in Socialist organizations, hastened the dissolution of the International. Jealousy of each other seems never to be absent among Socialist leaders, and it existed in a marked degree between Bakounin and Marx, and between the latter and the Lassalleans. Lassalle was killed the year the International was organized, in a duel that he forced upon his successful rival for a lady's hand. His followers, though otherwise Marxian in their beliefs, advocated political action, which Marx opposed. Marx's adversaries charged that this opposition on his part was due to his being a refugee, which prevented him from acting as leader in any movement not frankly revolutionary. Their differences were compromised at the Congress of Basle, partly, it seems, on account of the defection of Bakounin as a Marxian partisan, and to defeat his insurgency which threatened to capture the International. Bakounin had been an active revolutionist. He was sentenced to death for his part in the Saxon revolt of 1849, but escaped the extreme penalty because of a dispute among the Powers as to their priority of right to execute him. He was later banished to Siberia, but escaped. Returning to Europe, he joined the International and, becoming dissatisfied with Marx's continued leadership, organized the International Alliance of Socialists. This division, together with the collapse of the Commune, caused the dissolution of the Marxian International. It did not meet after 1873. The Bakounin International disappeared about the same time.

For something like a decade from this date, the international movement had no central organization. That it was not dormant, however, appears from the number of Socialist parties and revolutionary societies formed during that period, especially in Germany, Russia, and the United States. In Germany, these multiplied so rapidly that within a few years it was thought by their leaders that, if the ruling Emperor were removed, they could overthrow the government. Accordingly, in 1878, there was an attempt made to assassinate Emperor William, but it was unsuccessful. This was the occasion for the attack by Bismarck on the Socialists, in which he was finally compelled to court favor with the Center-Party to prevent defeat.

In Russia, the assassins were more successful. The Socialists, Morris and Bax, say that "the slaying of the Czar, in March, 1881, with the tragic scenes that followed it, was the most dramatic event that the Russian movement has given to the world. The courage [!] and devotion [!] that went to the accomplishment of this lightning-stroke, had great effect on progressively-minded [!] persons." It was largely the vigor and dispatch with which the government put an end to these "tragic scenes" that caused Tolstoi to advance his curious doctrine of "Non-interference."

In the United States, though there were no Socialist assassinations of high officials during this period, there were strikes and riots a-plenty, instigated by them, and accompanied by characteristic lawlessness and crime. The assassination of Garfield has been charged to Socialist teaching, but this is not warranted. Guiteau was maddened by disappointment at being denied a diplomatic

post at Marseilles, and his act was due to a fit of frenzy. It is perhaps truer to say that Guiteau's act flowed from a state of mind that harbors Socialist sentiment, which broods over disappointment with ever-lowering gloominess and finally despairs and becomes lost in violent passion. But Socialist teaching is responsible for the memorable Tompkins Square riot that occurred in New York during the seventies; and for similar outbreaks occurring in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and other large cities. President Hayes was compelled to send out the Federal troops on account of Socialist violence, and West Virginia was placed under martial law. The excitement extended into the West. At St. Louis, a self-constituted Socialist junta undertook to establish a new city government and proceeded to make laws in violation of constitutional limitations and to divide and distribute property in disregard of pre-existing right.

Such, in brief, was the state of Socialism when John Most formed the second International at New York, in 1883. Most had served two terms of imprisonment on the Continent and one in England before he came to the United States. Upon his arrival in New York he established a newspaper, the *Freiheit* (Freedom), and at once set about forming the new International, using as a nucleus for this purpose the Revolutionary Socialist Labor Party, which was then making war on what was termed "the spineless attitude" of the Socialist Labor Party. The new International was short-lived. After a few meetings it organized the notorious Chicago demonstrations that ended in the bomb riot of Haymarket Square. As a sequel to the riot, four of the leaders of the International were hanged for murder. This practically ter-

minated the existence of the organization, and during the next few years the international movement was again without a recognized central body.

In 1889, a third International was organized at Paris. This organization still exists. Its central bureau is at Brussels. There have been nine International Conventions (Congresses) since the organization started. Each country where Socialism is seriously agitated, is represented in these Congresses, and each has two standing representatives known as Secretaries, who compose the permanent body of the organization, which is officially called The International Congress of the World.

III. NATIONAL PARTIES

It is clearly beyond the limits assigned to this study to review the development of the various Socialist parties in each country. We must content ourselves with a rapid sketch of their growth as it has been in Germany, England, and the United States. Germany is the birth-place of the Socialist movement, and as such deserves to be considered in the most limited sketch of the movement's history. The Socialist idea originated in England, and this entitles her to a place in the most cursory treatment of the movement. The United States comes in for special mention for our own sake.

1. *Germany.*

Lassalle, who founded the Workingmen's Party in 1862, was a man of popular attainments. He had a smatter of learning, indomitable energy, and unflagging zeal, and his party grew rapidly for a few years. At his death, in 1864, however, its numbers had considerably

diminished and that tragic event served to hasten its decay. At the Congress of Eisenach, 1869, when Marx compromised with the Lassalleans, the Socialist Party was formed. Notwithstanding it was under the leadership of the two Marxian partisans of greatest note at the time, Bebel and Liebknecht, this party excited no enthusiasm. The compromise that gave it birth was not final, as compromises usually are not. The sympathisers of Marx continued to decry all measures short of revolutionary uprisings; the followers of Lassalle's old policies continued to advocate political action. During the war with France the Lassalleans formed the Democratic Party, confessedly a misnomer, but it was little more than a nominal organization. The war, followed by the Paris Commune, deadened the sympathies for Socialism of all who were not closely affiliated with one of these parties, and the unprecedented prosperity, accompanied by low taxes, great national enterprise, and state initiative in beneficent projects,—all due to the amazing rapidity with which France paid the war indemnity,—went a long way to dispel the enthusiasm of the Socialists themselves.

In 1875, when the famous Gotha Program, which Marx had opposed and finally caused to be revised, was adopted, a fusion of all Socialist factions was effected, and the Social Democratic Party was formed. The reaction from the "Five Milliard Boom" began about this time, and general depression set in. Socialist enthusiasm grew accordingly. Discontent became widespread, and the newly formed party of the Socialists captured one seat after another in the Reichstag. In May, 1878, and again in June, attempts were made to assassinate the

Emperor. They were both unsuccessful, but like lightning flashes they illumined the depths towards which the Socialists were trying to drive the German people. In October, the Reichstag passed a law suppressing the Socialist party and its propaganda for a term of three years. This term was extended from time to time until 1890, when the law was repealed.

In the meantime, the Socialists had carried on their agitation secretly, which explains how they won thirty odd seats in the Reichstag at the next election. In the next election they increased the number ten, and in the next ten more, and they have since continued to hold the balance of power in the august assembly of the Empire.

The working principles of German Socialists are set out in the Erfurt Program, adopted in 1891. This Program is a revision of the Gotha Program in the particulars in which Marx objected to the latter. It embodies the basic principles of the Manifesto, and its adoption was a great personal victory for Marx and finally terminated the old dispute between him and the Lassalleans, the latter passing into oblivion from this date. At the same time, the Erfurt Congress expelled Werner, Wildberger, and their followers, termed "Young Socialists," who advocated revolutionary demonstration in preference to political action or "parliamenting" as a tactic. It is a curious fact that, though this had been Marx's earlier view, before the Paris Commune and similar uprisings had cost the advocates of violence the sympathy of all worthy citizens, he now procured the expulsion of those holding it, while at the same time he insisted on destroying the Lassalleans and repudiating

their Gotha Program for tacitly condemning his earlier view.

It is said by the German historian, Headlam, that "all attempts to win the workingmen from the doctrinaire Socialists failed. They continued to look on the whole machinery of government, Emperor and army, Church and law, as their natural enemies." And yet, the enthusiastic "Young Socialists," having been expelled, it seems, as Headlam says further, that "which began as a revolutionary movement, became a dogmatic and academic school of thought; it seemed as if the orthodox interpretation of Marx's doctrines was of more importance than an improvement in the condition of the workmen."

Hardly had these divisions been healed when another one occurred. This was between the orthodox Marxians and the so-called Revisionists, at first led by Vollmar and later by Bernstein. Vollmar opposed revolutionary impetuosity. He aimed to work on conditions in present society and to advance the interests of the workingmen by such reforms as were possible under existing circumstances. He was opposed in the most vigorous terms by Marx, Bebel, Liebknecht, Kautsky, and others, who contemptuously called his teaching "State Socialism." At the Berlin convention, 1892, it was resolved: "Social Democracy is essentially revolutionary; State Socialism is conservative. Social Democracy and State Socialism are irreconcilable opposites." Notwithstanding this defeat of Vollmar and the "State Socialists," they continued to urge their teachings, and seven years later, at the convention of Hanover, under the leadership of the brilliant and indefatigable propagandist, Bernstein,

they procured the adoption of the following resolution: "Every kind of organization among workingmen for the safeguarding and promoting of their interest is considered as a proper means of educating the laboring classes in the management of their own affairs." Marx was dead then. His followers succeeded in partially covering their defeat by procuring the following adopted: "There is no reason for our party to change its principles or to adopt different tactics, or a different name."

This compromise between the Marxists and the Bernsteinists was later construed by each side to be a victory for itself. The former insisted that the last resolution, which the Bernsteinists supported, implied an abandonment of the Revisionist policy, while the latter claimed that the first resolution, which the Marxists supported, showed a definite change of the orthodox front. At the Lübeck convention, 1901, Bebel moved to condemn the construction that Bernstein stood on, and the Revisionists moved to condemn the construction of the Marxists. The former motion prevailed by nearly ten to one. Since that time, the Social Democratic Party of Germany, led by orthodox Marxists, has been practically the only Socialist party in Germany. While it continues to hold the balance of power in the Reichstag, it adheres to the orthodox interpretation of the Marxian teachings and steadfastly opposes all measures that do not look to the destruction of the whole social edifice. Germany was the first country to adopt workingmen's insurance and compensation laws and to provide old-age pensions. These were initiated while the Socialists were under Bismarck's political ban. After the ban was removed, similar provisions to secure social justice were proposed,

such as those against child-labor and female labor in certain industries and for fixing a shorter work-day and a minimum wage. These provisions have met with uniform opposition from Socialists. Socialists consistently oppose all such measures. They move on the theory that the best means of hastening the advent of Socialism is to increase the suffering and misery of the working classes, so that they will be the sooner roused to class-consciousness and the more easily excited to revolutionary activity. The growing prosperity of the German people constantly renders it more difficult for the Socialists to retain their numbers. The elections of late years have shown a marked falling off among them. But they are still a power seriously to be reckoned with in many portions of the Empire. A change in tactics may render them more formidable. A change in conditions may obscure them for a time.* A fundamental change in their teachings is the only thing that will make them less of a menace to society and civilization.

2. *England.*

Though the Socialist Idea originated in England, if not with Bacon and Harrington, then with Godwin, Thompson, and Hall, and though the Socialist movement had spread to this country as early as the second decade of the nineteenth century, when the Luddites carried on their destructive campaign against the introduction of machinery, Socialist parties did not appear here until about 1880, and then they principally existed in the form of "Clubs." In 1881, the various clubs of

* Since writing the above, the great war now (1915) being waged in Europe was begun, and all Socialist agitation seems to be suspended.—*Author.*

London professing radical doctrines organized under the name of the Democratic Federation. They had hardly federated when dissensions arose among them, and these increased until 1883, when the Democratic Federation broke up and the Social Federation was formed. Differences caused a schism in this body also, and within a year a rival body, the Socialist League, was formed. Two years later occurred the notorious "West-end" riots. Four members of the Federation were condemned for having incited these, and that organization speedily dissolved. In 1890, dissensions arose in the League, and in consequence it, also, was dissolved.

About this time the Fabian Society took form as a Socialist body. Then the Socialist Society was organized. Various other organizations, such as the Bristol Socialists, the Hammerstein Socialists, and the Socialist parties of Aberdeen and Glasgow, rapidly came into existence and as rapidly passed away. So little of a permanent character was accomplished up to this time, that Engels, in 1895, was provoked to remark that he did not believe English workingmen had any desire to better their condition except for the present generation. And up to 1900, among seven hundred members of Parliament, the nearest approach to a Socialist was Keir Hardie, the labor leader.

It is difficult to classify Hardie with reference to Socialism. Though avowing himself a Socialist, and though he made a tour of the United States in the interests of Socialism here, he is not an orthodox Marxist, not a revolutionist, and though perhaps radical in some particulars, he does not seek to overthrow society or to destroy capitalism, but only by lawful means to advance

to the extreme the interests of the working classes. The Labor Party of England, therefore, of which Hardie* is the founder, teacher, and leading spirit, cannot be classed as strictly a Socialist party, notwithstanding it has a large Socialist membership. Nor can we so class the Fabian Society, which during the present century has been the only other extensive organization in England that is largely composed of Socialists, for it is not a true expression of the Scientific Socialist movement. This is a middle-class party. It is engaged principally in propaganda, not politics, and its main object is to force existing political parties to accede to certain "immediate" Socialist demands, while it educates the middle classes, not the proletariat, to "ultimate" Socialist principles.

While the Labor Party and the Fabian Society are the strongest organizations that English Socialists have ever been affiliated with, and during the last two decades practically the only ones of importance, there are other organizations that bear mention, such as the Christian Socialists, founded by Kingsley; the State Socialists, headed by Wells; the Labor Socialists, for whom MacDonald is a chief spokesman; the Revolutionary Socialists, among whom Blatchford is a leader; the Free-Love Socialists, whose immoral teachings are seen in the writings of Shaw and Carpenter.

It would be too tedious to go into the history of these and other Socialist schools, some of which no longer exist in England, and none of which perhaps ever existed outside of her principal cities. That they existed at all is doubtless due to the failure of the Labor Party and

* Since going to press Mr. Hardie died, September 26, 1915.—*Ed.*

the Fabian Society to set forth the fundamental tenets of Scientific Socialism. But while on that account these organizations have failed to satisfy all schools, by the same token they have drawn into their ranks great numbers who otherwise probably would not be there.

The truth is, there is not much Socialism in England, especially not much of a Socialist movement. The English temperament does not encourage the growth of Socialist sentiment, and, lacking a virile sentiment, the movement does not spread. For centuries, the English have been noted for their adherence to the forms of law, religion, property rights, and the family, though they doubtless regard the substance of these no more than other peoples. This very conventionalism, saying it is no more than conventionalism, is a protection and a safeguard against radical teaching and revolutionary movements. Hence, Scientific Socialism, which is essentially both radical and revolutionary, has never made much headway in England. In France, where the temperament of the people is quick and impulsive, the government has nearly collapsed time and again and the whole social edifice has been more than once imperilled by Socialism. The reason is plain: the Socialist sentiment is in a constant state of effervescence, and this makes for the growth of the movement. In Germany, although the temperament of the people is more staid, there is a complete disregard of conventions as such. Hence, the movement has grown in Germany, but it has not produced results. The government is constantly threatened by its presence, but never endangered. Not being jealous of their institutions, as are the English, merely because "the memory of man runneth not to the con-

trary," the Germans approach the study of Socialism with an open mind. But they are not carried away by the impulse prompted by its gilded proposals. These proposals are carefully examined; and they are rejected by all who have not already fallen into error through perverted teachings, when, misled by preconceived ideas of being, truth, God, law, right, justice, good, they subscribe to Socialism. These have their unthinking followers; they appeal to the discontented and the lawless, and altogether they muster three or four out of sixty millions. In consequence, though Germany has a Socialist movement, it seems to be a kind of fixed movement, having reached its limits, and in many years it has varied but little in character or extent. The English, on the other hand, do not approach Socialism with an open mind. The mere fact that it is arrayed against their time-honored institutions, prejudices them against it at the outset, and as a result of this attitude of mind, there has not been an English Socialist movement to chronicle.

Here, then, we have three distinct national types, and as many different results, showing in the Socialist movement. With the French it has carried far, but it has not been a constant quantity. Now it has overthrown the government and brought society so near to destruction that the Powers alone could save it, and now it has fallen into oblivion, only to spring forth again when famine, drouth, pestilence or war invited it to prey upon a stricken people. With the Germans, it has been more constant, but it has not carried far. A few assassinations, a few riots, a world of propaganda and enough seats in the Reichstag to constitute the balance of power, but with no institution, no law, and no State policy to

its credit,—such is the result of the German movement. The results of the English movement are so negligible they do not show where there has been a movement. Though the Socialist idea originated with them, the English did not entertain it. They scarcely tolerated it. The *idea* was more tolerant to the Germans. Its ablest exponents are found among them. Marx, Engels, Dietzgen, Liebknecht, Kautsky, Bebel produced a Socialist literature that caused discontent, the starting point of Socialist sentiment. But the fully developed sentiment is too impetuous, too violent for the stolid Germans. They look before they leap, and they leap by inches. If conventionalism saved the English from Socialism, common sense saved the Germans. In France, the Idea and the Sentiment were both fully developed, and when they were combined, the movement sprang forth like a mad giant bent on destruction. Society was ill; it was diseased with infidelity, irreligion, immorality, injustice,—sick to death with godlessness and all the ills that must attend this sad condition in a society; then came famine, drouth and war, and Society was prostrate when the giant arose. The intervening Powers saved France, as they alone can ever save the nation that tolerates and encourages the Idea and the Sentiment of Socialism while it suffers its institutions to grow diseased with godlessness and its attendant ills.

3. *United States.*

In this country, the first half of the nineteenth century claims attention as the experimental stage of Socialism. Several hundred Socialist communities were established in the various States during this time. Some were conducted on the “Phalanx” idea of Fourier, some

on the plan of Saint-Simon, some were followers of Cabet, some of Owen, some of Rapp. All failed. The Socialist historians, Kirkup, Noyes, Waltershausen, Hillquit, Ely, assign various causes for their failure, but try to acquit Socialism, especially Scientific Socialism, of all blame. It is not our purpose here to do more than note the fact of their failure and to separate this period of Socialist history from that which followed.

The revolutionary phase of Socialism in America begins with the coming of Weitling to the United States, immediately after the European revolutions of 1848. Having taken an active part in those revolutions, Weitling keenly realized that it would be healthier for him in this country than at home, as did many others, who came over at the same time. This man is mentioned by Hillquit as "the connecting link between Utopian and Scientific Socialism in the United States." In 1850, he formed the Central Committee of United Trades, which was intended to unite the Icarians with the Farmers' and Mechanics' Protective Association, the latter of which had been organized for the establishment of an Exchange Bank similar to Owen's experimental Bank of Labor, in which labor certificates were substituted for money, which, like the rest of Owen's schemes, had failed. The General Workmen's League, which had previously established "Communia," in Iowa, was later brought into this scheme of unification instead of the Icarians. The Socialistic Gymnastic Unions, a tactical organization formed to make use of the physical culture enthusiasm then displayed in both Europe and America, were also a factor in this unification plan.

The organization was finally perfected during the

financial depression of the fifties, under the name, National Labor Union. In the meantime, the Free Soil Party, so well known in the political history of this period, had become rather influential, if not as an organization, at least as a propaganda, and the Socialist federation tactfully adopted as its own a number of the Free Soilers' demands.

The National Reform Party, later the Labor Reform Party, was organized through the skillful manipulation of the National Labor Union by the celebrated Wm. Sylvis, who from the middle of the fifties until his death, in 1869, was the leading spirit in the Socialist movement. The movement was on a sharp decline before his death, and that event precipitated the dissolution of the National Reform Party, which left the movement almost dead. Strenuous effort was made to revive it by Jessup, who sought to affiliate the Reform Party with the International, then showing signs of permanency. Jessup also procured the adoption of certain "Farmer Resolutions" with a view of filling the depleted ranks from men of the soil. But his efforts came to naught, and from the death of Sylvis little is heard of the Socialist parties that had previously been formed.

From this time until after the serious financial crisis of 1873, there was quiet in Socialist circles. The brutal excesses of the Paris Commune embarrassed their "Comrades" of this country. Moreover, from the close of the War Between the States, an unusual wave of prosperity visited America and did not break until the panic of 1873. This caused a further decline of Socialism. In his history of Socialism, Hillquit pertinently remarks that "when a new wave of prosperity would strike the

country, the spirit of discontent would subside and the Socialist votes would disappear."

The panic of 1873, perhaps the most serious in the financial history of America, was precipitated by the collapse of the Northern Pacific. The five years preceding this failure had been years of remarkable activity in railroad circles throughout the country, and this activity had seriously inflated values in many lines of industry, especially steel and iron. It has been estimated that within sixty days from the time of this failure, three million families had been reduced to want throughout the country. Demonstrations and riots followed, in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Illinois, Missouri. The state militia was routed, Federal troops were called out and martial law was proclaimed. "The Socialists," says Hillquit, "did not neglect this excellent opportunity to propagate their theories among the excited masses."

The Social Democratic Party of North America was formed in 1874. From a division arising at its first meeting, the Socialist Workingmen's Party arose. But neither of these parties was acceptable to all factions. One faction formed the Labor Party in Illinois, another formed the Socio-Political Union in Ohio, and when these two endeavored to unite, a newly developed faction formed the Workingmen's Party of the United States. In 1876, most of these factions came together in the American Federation of Workingmen's Associations, which later became the Socialist Party of North America.

By this time confidence had been fully restored in the financial world and a new era of prosperity had set

in. In consequence, Socialist enthusiasm began to decline with its usual custom. Hillquit says of Socialism during this period: "The struggles of the party grew harder and harder: the social contentment of the masses seemed impregnable; no new converts were made and the old members grew disheartened and dropped out in large numbers."

In 1883, John Most formed the International Working-peoples Association at New York. His paper, the *Freiheit*, carried on a discussion with the Official Bulletin of the Socialist Labor Party, edited by Secretary Van Patten. Most's object was to convince Socialists of the futility of any political action not purely revolutionary and of any organization not international. He succeeded so well that Van Patten, seeing the support of his own party failing him, resigned in disgust. He joined the International, became one of its leaders, and was among the four hanged for inciting the Haymarket Square riots. Inciting riots was one of the policies of Most's International, but in this case it proved a fatal expedient and caused the organization to lose its most capable leaders. Its dissolution quickly followed.

The spirit of the Socialist Labor Party was revived when its rival became inactive. It induced Liebknecht to come from Europe and canvass this country in order to counteract the effects of the International's policy. No more fitting person could have been selected for pouring oil upon angry waters. His work on *Tactics* is ample evidence of his unprincipled view that the success of the party "is our only law, our only rule; the essential thing is that Socialism shall triumph; the non-essential is *HOW*." Hence, though he had consistently

advocated revolutionary action in Europe, Liebknecht appeared as an ardent advocate of political action in this country and denounced the Internationalists for doing what for many years, in the face of opposition from the Lassalleans, he himself had been advising.

Liebknecht was followed in his tour by Eleanor Marx and Edward Aveling. She was a daughter of Marx, he was an unsuccessful physician of London, who had abandoned his wife and children to live with this woman and preach Socialism. Marx himself did not object to this relation, but on the contrary approved it and expressed pride in his left-handed son-in-law. Sometime after Marx's death Aveling tired of Eleanor and abandoned her. She committed suicide. Notwithstanding the relation of the two was well known at the time they were touring America, and to all appearances was maintained while they were here, they were received by the Socialists with great enthusiasm, and Leagues and Associations and Societies of Socialists rapidly multiplied as a consequence.

The slight depression occasioned by the presidential elections of 1888, made the time ripe for this Socialist reaction. The Populist Party and the Farmers' Alliance had been organized to continue the effort previously undertaken by the Greenback and Labor parties, to break into the ranks of the old-line parties, and Socialists profited by their propaganda. The Henry George movement had also appeared, and it received the support of the Socialists. The Knights of Labor, for long a secret organization, had declared itself, and the American Federation of Labor had been formed, and Socialists tried to affiliate with these, "every convention," as Hill-

quit says, "having a larger or smaller number of agitators who endeavored to utilize the occasion for the propagation of their theories." These affiliative tactics were the result of Liebknecht's visit; but they came to naught. The American Federation was an unalloyed labor organization, and both it and the Knights of Labor came to be in the position of daggers drawn with Socialists and Socialism. Then the worm turned and tried to sting. From 1895 to 1899, De Leon, editor of *The People*, and Vogt, editor of the *Vorwärts*, the two most influential Socialist papers, carried on a systematic warfare against "pure and simple labor-unions, Populists, Nationalists, and other fakirs."

In 1892, for the first time, the Socialists offered a candidate for President. Prior to this time they had consistently demanded the abolition of that office, but this year saw the demand omitted from their platform. The financial depression of 1893 did not swell the ranks of the party, as panics usually do, doubtless on account of the many other parties to which the discontented elements of the masses could turn. But it brought about a new leader among Socialists. This was Eugene V. Debs, who, in 1894, organized the famous Pullman strike at Chicago, in which for the first time the injunctive power of the courts was invoked against strikers. Debs served a term of imprisonment for contemptuously violating the court's order, and since then has been "a law-abiding citizen under protest." Debs also organized the Industrial Union, which is a union of all persons in a single industry. He later organized the Industrial Workers of the World, a syndicalist body with tactics similar to those of the Syndicalists of France.

In 1897, the Socialist Democratic Party of America was formed by Debs. At its first convention dissension arose, and Debs was outvoted. He then formed another party, the Socialist Democratic Party of the United States.

In 1899, there was a split in the Socialist Labor Party when a delegation from Rochester refused to acknowledge the leadership of De Leon. The matter was carried to the courts and the De Leon faction won. It was called up at the next convention and the Rochester faction won.

In 1900, the Rochester faction and Debs arranged terms for the affiliation of the Socialist Democratic and the Socialist Labor parties, but after having been approved by the rank and file of both parties, this project somehow failed.

A year later, the Socialist Party was formed. Another revival was thought advisable at this time to persuade the masses that Socialism, as represented by the new party, was the only hope of the working people. The celebrated Russian Socialist, Gorky, together with Madame Andreiva, toured the United States in an endeavor to arouse popular enthusiasm. Gorky, like Aveling, had left his wife and family to live with this woman and preach Socialism. There is a pathetic incident connected with this fact in the way of a sequel. Gorky and the woman travelled the world over, spreading the gospel of Socialism. The deserted peasant wife devoted her life to her family. Gorky's health failed, his income began to come slow and then stopped, and the woman left him. Next, it was reported that he was dying at some obscure place in Italy, penniless, abandoned. His

faithful wife, in Russia, learning of his condition, went to him like a true Christian.

Curiously enough, about the time that Gorky and his paramour were parading their moral bankruptcy and everywhere receiving the plaudits of Socialists, the notorious Herron-Rand affair was taking place. Herron, also, had a wife and family. He had been a Congregationalist minister, and in 1898, together with Bliss and Ely, he formed the sect called Christian Socialists. He later denied Christianity, as those who go in for Socialism eventually always do. He became enamored with a Miss Rand, abandoned his wife and family and contracted a common-law marriage with the woman. Herron was already prominent in Socialist circles, but this salacious affair seemed to qualify him for advancement. He rose to the highest place, became a Secretary in the International Congress of the World, and for many years was the most featured leader of the party. He was second only to Gorky in importance as a revivalist for Debs' organization.

Notwithstanding the notorious character of these propagandists, the revival produced good Socialist results. Within two years, the new-born Socialist Party polled nearly a quarter million votes. In 1904, it mustered nearly half a million; in 1908, it passed the half-million mark, and, in 1912, it fell but a few short of a million. Its rival, the Socialist Labor Party, has preserved its organization, but has hardly been a factor in the Socialist movement of late, and promises shortly to disappear.

No serious divisions have yet occurred in the Socialist Party. Division has been threatened, but it has so far

been tactfully averted, proof doubtless of the "moulting" quality of Socialism that Bebel described in one of his speeches in the Reichstag.

The first of these near-schisms occurred at the national convention in 1904, over a dispute as to the party's attitude toward the trades-unions. The Socialist Labor Party has never changed its attitude of frank hostility to trades-unions since its final breach with the Knights of Labor and the Federation, in 1895, when all hope of using these organizations for the propagation of Socialism was abandoned by Vogt and De Leon. But the Socialist Party professed a friendship for trades-unions. In its platform of 1901, it declared it to be "the duty of Socialists to join the union of their respective trades." But in order to give the Rochester faction of De Leon's party an excuse for affiliation, it added that it was the duty of every trade-unionist to join the Socialist Party, because "while the efforts of trades-unions may result in lessening the exploitation of labor, they can never abolish that exploitation." In 1902, the Western Labor Union, the Western Federation of Miners, and the United Association of Hotel and Restaurant Employees indorsed the Socialist Party. But the American Federation refused to indorse it. The effort to secure its indorsement was renewed the following year, but the result was so decisive as to make it altogether hopeless to think of Socialism capturing this great labor body for a long time to come. When the Socialist convention met, in 1904, a large element favored the repudiation of trades-unions. After a prolonged discussion, during which a bolt was several times imminent, a compromise was effected in terms that declared trades-unions to be neces-

sary for the emancipation of the working class, but these unions must "equip their members by educating them in Socialist principles." Thus, the provision adopted in 1901 to make it easier for opponents of the unions to give allegiance to the new party, was reaffirmed in 1904 to quiet a rising insurgency; and the party was saved.

Another breach was imminent in 1908. This time it was with reference to whether or not the party should declare that Socialism has nothing to do with religion. The years since 1904 had been marked with great activity among Socialist propagandists, both here and abroad, and tens of millions of Socialist writings had been distributed. No means was neglected that could increase this flood of literature. The daily paper and the weekly; the monthly magazine, quarterly review, yearly almanac, gazettes, bulletins, post-cards, buttons, stickers,—all were employed to propagate the doctrines of Scientific Socialism. Christians took alarm at this excess of zeal for doctrines so execrable, and the spread of anti-Socialist literature was begun. To offset this counter attack, it was proposed in the convention of 1908, to declare that Socialism is purely an economic movement and has nothing to do with religion. Of course, all the delegates knew this to be untrue. But Hillquit, who wrote the platform and who, in defending this provision, admitted that 99 per cent. of all present were atheists, insisted that such a declaration was necessary "to give our speakers a chance to defend themselves from the charge that Socialism is against religion." This subterfuge did not immediately appeal to the delegates. True, they were Socialists and atheists, but they were not base hypocrites. "I know," said one of the delegates, "that the Socialist

position on religion does not make a good campaign subject, and I am willing we should be silent about it. But if we must speak, I propose that we go before this country with the truth, and not with a lie." But Hillquit held the whip-hand of the convention; the very delegate who delivered this frank utterance was induced to give his sanction to the "lie," and it was finally adopted by a majority of one. The Socialist papers reported that there had not been such a "conventional storm" in years, but that it was happily quelled and all could "now rejoice that the attitude of Socialism toward religion is clearly defined and no longer open to the criticism of ignorant and malicious preachers who oppose Socialism because they are tools of the capitalists and supremely interested in keeping the people in political and economic subjection." In 1912, Hillquit's "lie" was dropped from the platform without so much as a discussion, and it is notable that this is practically the only provision of the 1908 platform which was omitted from that of 1912.

Another breach was seriously threatened in the 1912 convention. Hillquit, with his ear to the ground, had heard the rumblings started by the Cooper Union speech of the notorious "I Won't Work" Bill Haywood. When that speech was made, the public mind was in a state of high tension on the subjects of lawlessness and violence. The *Los Angeles Times* explosion, the confession of the McNamaras, and the exposure of the terrible "Dynamiting Conspiracy," had put the general public in a frame of mind that would not tolerate such utterances as Haywood's. Accordingly, although he had gone unrebuked by Socialists at the time, even to all ap-

pearances had been made a Socialist hero for his treasonable words, Hillquit insisted that the convention go on record as condemning measures of violence. The opposition to his view was so strong that he was unable to get it adopted and he shrewdly consented to its submission to a general vote of the party. At the same time, as a further step in the way of placating public opinion, a measure to recall Haywood from the Executive Committee was submitted to a general vote. It was not proposed, however, to expel him from the party, which would seem consistent if the measure condemning violence is regarded as anything more than a mere expedient.

How long the Socialist Party will be able to hold together the jarring elements that compose it, is a matter of conjecture; but the indications are that before very long history will be repeated and division will appear. It is safe to predict that when it comes, the rank and file will follow the lead of their sympathies instead of the tactics of those who control the machinery of their organization, and then they will proclaim in their conventions, as of old, the sentiment inscribed upon the banners now carried in their processions: "No God! No Master! Down with the capitalists! The less work the better!"

THIRD PART
THE AIMS OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER ONE

AS A THOUGHT MOVEMENT

I. IN PHILOSOPHY

All intelligent action has some aim; whatever is aimless is not intelligent. An aim is a point considered in the mind as the end of self-directed motion. It is a definite point toward which the mind directs action. The point exists independently of the mind, but not as an aim; it is the mind directing action toward the point that makes it an aim. To constitute an aim, therefore, there must be a mind (subjective), a point (objective), and space or distance between; the mind directs action towards the point and it becomes the aim of that action.

These are homely truths, but for this very reason they are not infrequently suffered to pass out of mind. Such are the speed and intensity that characterize modern social activity, such is the desire for novelty and invention, that even self-evident truths are sometimes forgotten. Hence, although it is but repeating a truism to call to mind the threefold constitution of an aim, the purpose of this study seems to render it timely.

There is no aim in Socialist philosophy. Materialism excludes a subjective; dialectics excludes an objective; the action of matter upon itself cannot have a direction. Socialist philosophers say that matter "generates within

itself its own negation, and this negation in turn generates its negation, and so on indefinitely. . . . This is the eternal law, and it is fulfilled as strictly in the most minute particle of ether as it is in the molecule, the atom, the crystal, a plant, animal, man, earth, sun or the *entire universe*." Here are expressed all of the essentials of the Hegelian-Feuerbach base of the dialectic materialistic monism taught by Marx and Engels and religiously held as true by all Scientific Socialists. Feuerbach's universal principle of "matter" being substituted for Hegel's universal principle of "mind," it follows that the primary thought (thesis) of Hegel's dialectics is displaced by the *positive* existence of matter, while his non-thought (antithesis) is displaced by the *negation* of that existence. But it should be marked that the activity of matter thus exerted in generating its non-self, is exerted "within itself," where there can be no distinction between subjective and objective and where, therefore, it is impossible to posit an aim.

The application of the Socialist philosophy to human action serves to elucidate its aimless character. The cardinal feature of this philosophy, in its actual exemplification, is the assumed fact that all human activity is bent in the direction of increasing the accessible food supply. Narrowly viewed, this would seem to present an aim, since the subjective mind and the objective point are imagined as being distinct, and the mind as directing action with reference to the point. But a broader consideration dissipates this view. The principle of the all-inclusiveness of matter eliminates the distinction between subjective and objective, and in the light of that principle it cannot be said that human activity is subjective

and the food supply objective. It might as well be said that the food supply is the subjective point and human activity the objective, and that the aim is to increase human activity. Each factor is but a point in the universal principle of matter.

A familiar law of physics illustrates this view: an unsupported body will fall to the ground; from one viewpoint it falls of its own weight and seems to seek the earth, but from another viewpoint the earth attracts it; hence, the subjective and objective points vary according to the one or the other of these narrow views. But the truth is the earth "falls" toward an unsupported body just as much, considering size, as it falls toward the earth; they seek each other; they attract each other. This simple law at once removes the impression that it is possible for mere matter to present the distinction of subjective and objective to one of clear understanding.

Since the acquisition of food is the avowed aim of human activity, as viewed in this so-called philosophy, it is pertinent to inquire, why man wants food? It will of course be said, in order to live. But why live? The answer is, to be happy. Then, why the desire to be happy? "Oh, that is a foolish question!" On the contrary, it is a very sensible question. Molecules, atoms, ether particles do not desire to be happy, why should men? When did that desire creep into "matter"? Where did it come from? Is it an expression of matter's self, or of its non-self? And if of its self, why does not the change to its non-self blot it out? But if of its non-self, why does not the change to itself destroy it?

If the Socialist, taking his cue from Deville, says that

this desire, like all other conceivable things, is embodied eternally in matter, "just as the fruit is embodied in the seed from which it springs," then, why did it not stay embodied? what is the *aim* of its coming forth? If it be said, to attain to perfect happiness, then, what is perfect happiness in "matter"? Why is a well-fed mass of matter formed into a man happier than a well-filled mass of the same matter formed into a sponge? And how does the sponge know the difference and try to grow to man's estate?

These questions are pertinent to the search for an aim in Socialist philosophy. What is the aim of the eternal criss-cross action—the infinite negations, the blotting itself out only to come into existence again and again be blotted out—that Socialism predicates of matter? What is the aim of the universal struggle it predicates of life? of the everlasting conflict it predicates of society? It is no answer to speak of happiness until we know what is happiness, how one particle of mere matter can be happier than another particle, and how the other particle can perceive the difference and thereby be prompted to correct itself. Nor is it an answer to refer to progress, unless there is pointed out a standard of progress whereby the change of matter from itself to its otherness is seen to be progress, and the change back to itself further progress, and that matter perceives from its self-state that in passing to its otherness it progresses, and then perceives from its otherness that in passing back to itself it progresses further. There is no answer to these questions in Socialist teaching. It holds that "Nothing is, everything is becoming"; that the law of progress and life "is the eternal coming into exist-

ence and passing away"; that the only fixed principle in the universe is "the fixed principle that nothing is fixed"; and in so doing it shows plainly that it has no aim.

NOTE: This chapter should be considered in immediate connection with Chapter Two of First Part, where the philosophy of Socialism is treated with proper references. Should it be objected that the rank and file Socialists do not hold all the teachings of Scientific Socialists, we admit it; neither do they represent Socialism as a thought-movement, which is the special phase here being treated.

II. IN RELIGION

Socialism pretends to be a religion as well as a philosophy. It is a religion without a God, a heaven, a hell, or a moral code; a religion that denies human intelligence, free will, and immortality. Yet, if we listen to its inspiring apostles, a religion it certainly is. What is the aim of such a religion? It should have an aim, since that which is aimless is not intelligent; and its aim should be consistent with Socialist fundamentals. Its aim cannot be to worship God or to attain heaven or to avoid hell, for it denies the existence of all these. It cannot be an aim with reference to anything or to any point outside of mere matter, for it holds that there is nothing but matter.

Socialist philosophy admits the existence of man and of the brute, and that in some respects these are separate and distinct. Here we discern the three requisites for an aim, the subjective mind (presumably in man), the objective point, and the space or distance between; it is only required that action be directed by the mind

toward the point, and there exists a definite aim. That the aim thus indicated is not acceptable to most people, is not the question; if that is not the aim of Socialist religion, it is aimless; in no other direction than toward the brute is there an objective point whose existence is admitted by Socialist science. Moreover, though repugnant to the finer sensibilities of the Socialists even, this back-to-the-brute aim is in perfect harmony with the principle of Socialist progression, which consists in the development of antitheses. According to the Socialists, man proceeded from the brute through an infinite series of negations; hence it is natural, not to say inevitable, that when the term of his development is reached, he must go back to the brute by virtue of this same law of negations.

But it is claimed that Humanism, or "the solidarity of the human race," is the religious aim of Socialism. This aim is described as one of surpassing greatness, far removed from all brutish ideas, and exceeding in purity and truth the aim of all other religions. Exactly what the phrase "solidarity of the human race" signifies, is not clear. But certainly it has no reference to a spiritual condition, for whatever smacks of the spiritual is repugnant to Socialist philosophy. Being limited to its material significance, it must refer either to the mental or to the physical solidarity of the race, if not to both. If mental, the Socialist is carried backward with the evolutionary swing toward brute existence, where there exists a mental solidarity that is not broken by so much as the gift of speech, not to mention the power of understanding. If physical, the swing is only of wider sweep, the brute line is passed and

“Dust mingles with dust and ashes with ashes lie.”

Thus, the Socialist who adheres to the basic principles of his philosophy, is tossed between the two horns of a dilemma and must admit that his religion is aimless or worse than aimless.

The difficulty in the way of so many Socialists who try to get at the truth and yet fail to discern the absurdities involved in Socialist teaching, arises from their failure to make that teaching stand its own ground. Whatever in Socialism is possible, is made so by virtue of it being reconciled to things with which Socialism is radically at issue. Many overlook the conflict, but note the harmony, and give Socialism the credit. This is clearly illustrated by the phrase under discussion. If taken in a spiritual sense, the “solidarity of the human race” is both suggestive and appealing; the deepest and truest religious impulse is prompted by it; it is but another way of saying: “Thy Kingdom come on earth.” And whether consciously or unconsciously, men of good intention grasp this spiritual significance of the phrase, not necessarily in a pious sense, but with an instinctive religious feeling, a feeling which holds man in that esteem which his rational nature demands and to which his immortal soul more than entitles him. Men of good will are prompt to espouse whatever promises or proposes the *uplift* of mankind, and Socialism comes to them with this pretense. Many do not pause to consider that Socialism denies that anything exists for mankind to be lifted up to, and they are deceived by this false pretense. Caution should be observed to consider Socialist proposals from a Socialist standpoint only. Not to do

this is to invite unnecessary confusion of thought and fatal disorder of purpose.

III. IN MORALS

There is widely read among Socialists, especially in America, a little book entitled, *The Folly of Being Good*, by Chas. H. Kerr, editor of the *International Socialist Review*. This title does not indicate what is the aim of Socialist morals, but it leaves no doubt as to what is *not* the aim. Both the philosophy and the religion of Socialism ratify the notion that it is folly to be good; they would even support a thesis on *The Folly of Being*, which indeed, a number of leading Socialists may be said to have very seriously maintained by calmly committing suicide.

But if the aim of Socialist morals is not to be good, is it, on the other hand, to be bad? Certainly not; that also, would be a folly. Then, since there are only good, bad, and indifferent acts, indifference must be the aim of Socialist morals.

This conclusion does not depend upon the chance title of a cheap bit of literature. Socialist teaching, in its basic outlines as well as in its structural details, is ingrained with the idea that it is foolish to be good or to be bad, foolish to consider the moral quality of human action. It holds that, in the last analysis, man has no free choice, but is governed willy-nilly by his environment; and moreover, that if he had a free choice, he has no self-consciousness to guide him in its use; and finally, that if he had self-consciousness, there is no fixed standard to which he can refer its direction; hence to speak of the moral quality of human conduct is to speak

nonsense. Where this is not expressly taught by Socialists it is unmistakably implied in their doctrine of economic determinism.

The indifference of Socialist thought and teaching to moral qualities is shown by their bearing on social institutions that are intimately connected with morality, such as marriage, property, law. Socialism holds these institutions in no esteem. It would abolish marriage, destroy property, dispense with law. It would reduce human existence and human activity to a downright mechanical process in keeping with its dialectic of "coming into existence and passing away," and it is in the light of these proposals that its moral aim, or its moral aimlessness, must be considered and judged.

Considering Socialism in its broad sweep as a thought-movement, all of its teachings are annulled, rendered aimless and unintelligent, through dialectic materialistic monism. Its sociality becomes non-social, its morality non-moral, its religion non-religious, its whole array of principles illogical, impossible, contradictory, and senseless at every point where they come under the shadow of the monumental deceit called evolutionary materialism. Indeed, it cannot truly be said to have principles, but only erratic, phantastic theories that masquerade as principles. It cannot be truly called a thought-movement; it is just a mental ferment that rises from the commingling of sentiment and passion with ignorance and disappointment. It is like a rudderless and dismantled ship manned by a mutinous crew that disdains chart and compass and knows not whence it came nor whither it is drifting.

If Socialists would only stand by their philosophy,

there would be no occasion to examine their aims, for the necessary consequence of their fatalistic theories is non-action. But Socialists are the one class of persons in the world for whom necessary consequences are not necessary. They are gifted with a peculiar mental faculty that none but themselves can understand or rightly appreciate; a faculty that sees no difficulty in admitting that two contradictory propositions are at the same time true, that a thing can be and at the same time not be, can be itself and at the same time something else. While they steadfastly hold that man's consciousness does not determine his life but is itself determined by his social life, they at the same time heartily condemn all who do not accept their views. While they claim that the advent of Socialism is as inevitable as the passing of time, they at the same time organize, agitate, work, fight,—and of their writing and talking there seems no end,—in order to hurry on its coming.

In fine, Socialists do not stand by their philosophy. They will not be convicted by their own testimony. Therefore, notwithstanding the obvious impossibility of establishing any proposal germane to the Socialist thought-movement without fatally conflicting with its teachings, practical considerations induce a more extended examination of Socialist aims as they appear in other phases of the movement, political, economic, social. Socialist fundamentals may not be entirely dispensed with here; they may be found indispensable later to bring out the true meaning of some involved teaching; but in what is to follow from this point their discussion shall in the main be treated as closed.

CHAPTER TWO

AS A POLITICAL MOVEMENT

I. REVOLUTION

Socialism is nothing if not revolutionary. In philosophy, in religion, in government, in life, its aim is to overthrow and destroy society. London says: "It is no less than to destroy existing society and take possession of the destinies of mankind."¹ In their revolutionary proposals Socialists are even more radical than are anarchists. Veblen says: "Of the two, the Socialists are more widely out of touch with the established order, more hopelessly negative and destructive in their proposals."² So thorough would be the revolution they contemplate that its accomplishment would not leave of civilization anything but a memory. Bax says: "It is toward a world where Civilization shall have ceased to be, that the Socialist of to-day sets his eyes."³

The first and final aim of Socialism, as a political movement, is to effect the "Great Revolution" thus broadly outlined. Revolution is the watchword of the movement: "*Vive la Révolution!*" exclaims the recog-

¹ Address to the Students of Yale, 1906.

² *Theory of Business Enterprise*, 338. See article, "Veblen as a Revolutionist" (*Int. Soc. Rev.* vol. 5, p. 726), for an estimate of his critical views of Socialism.

³ *Universal History from a Socialist Standpoint*.

nized standard-bearer of the movement in America; "The most heroic word in all the languages is Revolution! Let us glorify the revolutions of the past and hail the Great Revolution that is to come!"⁴

In the furtherance of this aim, Socialists make continual war upon society. The points of their immediate attack are religion, the family, and the State. La Monte says: "The realization of the political and economic aims of Socialism involves the atrophy of Religion, the metamorphosis of the Family, and the suicide of the State."⁵ The point of their ultimate attack is private property. Debs says: "The historic mission of the movement is to abolish the system based upon private ownership."⁶

According to the Socialist reading of history, the first divisions of property in primitive society gave rise to a corresponding division of society into classes, and there sprang up between these classes a struggle for position which resulted in the formation of the State. With the narrowing of the divisions of property through time, the economic interests of classes were narrowed to individual interests, and there sprang up in each individual the desire to perpetuate his holdings by transmitting to his offspring; hence, the Family became necessary that the individual might know his offspring. The establishment of these institutions probably was not very difficult, but as the advantages thereby secured became multiplied over and over, a constantly increasing number of persons had to be deprived, and the ruling class foresaw that in the

⁴ *Writings and Speeches of Debs.*

⁵ *Socialism, Positive and Negative.*

⁶ *Op. cit.*

distant future it would not be able to preserve its advantage by mere force, so to supplement the State and Family the scheme of God and religion was devised to "chloroform" the subject class into submission, while it was being oppressed and robbed; and hence, religion holds out special promises to the poor, lays special stress upon obedience, insists upon the rights of property, the authority of the State, and the inviolability of the marriage vow. This is the way Socialists explain how there has grown up in the world what Marx was pleased to term "a perverted civilization, in which the idea of God is the keystone, and the right of property the foundation."

In revolutionizing civilization, Socialism inverts the order described and begins with an attack on religion. It pitches the line of engagement somewhere between thinly veiled irreverence and openly expressed hatred for religion, as policy dictates. It advances its posts as circumstances direct, shifts its position when expedient, calls a truce when necessary, but never falls back. It supports this attack with a flank movement against the family, and by scoffing at the virtue of married persons, condemning the objects of the marriage institution, pitying the dependence of married women, striving for a more facile severance of the marriage bond, teaching shamelessness in the relations of sex, encouraging the practice of free-love,—it brings numerous forces to bear down upon the social unit. At the same time another wing of the attack is directed against the State, and with a uniform and steadfast contempt for law and authority marking the entire sweep of its thought and action, and culminating in frequent acts of violence and

crime, it wages the issue with such signal effect that the social well-being is seriously threatened, where it is not actually endangered.

But the focal point against which these concerted attacks are all directed, is the right of private property. Socialism holds that upon the recognition of this right as upon a foundation are resting all of the institutions of a perverted civilization, and hence, its final aim is to uproot this foundation at the very bottom. If religion, the family and the State, are points of first attack, that is because it sees in them not only the fruits but also the guaranties of the right of private property. With the abrogation of religion and the passing of the stultifying faith in a heaven hereafter, it holds that men will seek to establish a heaven here, and then the State with all its equipment of armies and navies and laws and prisons and police, will be powerless to resist the demands of the awakened proletariat and, with the State's surrender, the last support that private property has will fall. If the family has not previously fallen as a result of the hypocrisy, the immorality, and the tyranny that weigh it down, it will then fall by virtue of the equality brought about between the sexes through the abrogation of property. Women then being free to mate and unmate at the promptings of their sexual impulses, the identity of parenthood will be lost and the instinct of acquisition in perpetuity, the very soil in which private ownership is rooted, will disappear and be forgotten. Then, Social Democracy, or the Co-operative Commonwealth, or the Workingman's Paradise, or The Great State, as Socialism is variously called, without a fear of God or the devil, will be ushered in to bless mankind forever.

1. *A Criticism.*

The aims of the Socialist politic are not of possible realization. The institutions of religion, the family, the State and private property cannot be destroyed; they are necessary for man to reach the term of his development, necessary for him to achieve the end of his existence. This goes with the saying, but it is not all that is to be said. Though not liable to destruction, these institutions are liable to disorder. An active, determined purpose to abolish religion, though never to be realized, encourages if it does not engender atheism and infidelity, the twin harlots that breed sin, anarchy and rebellion in society. A set plan looking to the destruction of the State, though never to be executed, provokes civil discord, lawlessness, violence, and crime. Serious attacks upon the family and the right of property, though finally repulsed, sow the seeds of domestic unhappiness, of sexual immorality and perversion, of deceit and dishonesty and all other kinds of thievish and corrupt practices. Where in any society a considerable number of its members have no respect for law, no regard for property, no concern for marriage, and freely indulge in mockeries of God and scoffings at religion, there cannot be peace or progress, there will be no blessings and but a mean existence for mankind.

But there is another side to this dismal picture, and it is covered with hope and promise and bright color. The aim of the Socialist politic as outlined upon the other side is contrary in all details to that already sketched. It holds out that in Socialisdom, religion, instead of being abolished, will be made real and perfect; its contradictions will be eliminated, its hypocrisies exposed, its

corrupt practices terminated; instead of being an instrument in the hands of unscrupulous capitalists, who employ it to keep the workingman looking towards heaven while they rob him, it will become in the hands of the workingman an instrument to destroy selfishness and make of all men brothers. It holds out that the family, instead of being extirpated from society, will be brought to the most exalted place in society; its economic inequalities will be abolished, the slavish dependence on the part of the woman, the universal infidelity on the part of the man, the one-sided code of morals on the part of society will come to an end; and marriage, instead of being a cloak for prostitution and adultery, will become a union of persons of true affinities; and children, instead of coming unwelcome into the world where they are a burden and a care, will be welcomed as a result of this union, which, being perfect itself, will produce a perfect offspring, whose upbringing will be an affectionate care upon all members of society. It holds out that the State, instead of being destroyed, will be more intelligently organized, so that the infinite waste of effort that now characterizes all lines of industry, the deplorable state of corruption that marks all departments of government, the artificial and oppressive class distinctions, the false ideals, the perversions of civilization that exist, will be finally and forever ended. It holds out that property rights, instead of being violated, will be established; that in the place of the present fiction, which mockingly declares the right of property to be sacred when two-thirds of society own none and are being systematically robbed of what they produce and thus hindered from ever owning any, will be set up an industrial condition

wherein all persons would have all the property they need. Thus is our first view of the Socialist aim contradicted and opposed in all particulars.

It could be wished that the view exhibited by the second of these sketches were something more than an ingenious Socialist tactic. But unfortunately, ~~civilization~~ is not built on paper. Human beings are necessary to its building, and as a rule, human beings are very human: if they are injured they retaliate, if oppressed, they rebel; when passion moves them they move apace, when nature prompts they respond; their desires are never filled, their cravings never satisfied, their ambitions never realized; put a beggar on horseback, and he will ask to be made king, set him to rule, and he will want to conquer, and if the world is brought under his dominion, like Alexander he will weep because there is no more territory.

In the light of these observations the tactical proposals of Socialist politics are seen in their true character. Considered apart from the elemental traits of human nature, they are mere creatures of fancy; considered in connection with those traits, they contradict all reason and all experience. Give man all the property he wants, let him love or lust as he lists, take away from him all fear of God and all restraint of authority, and his inherent propensities will urge him headlong to destruction. Freedom from all restraint means destruction for any finite being. Absolute liberty in effect is as fatal as absolute prohibition. Restraint is the law of progressive growth and the condition of advancing civilization. It is at once a requisite to individual security and a prerequisite to social stability.

The source of restraint on human impulse and human action are the will of God, the laws of nature, and the ordinances of society. The recognition and observance of these are necessary for the preservation of the human race. Socialist proposals do not meet this necessity. In keeping with Socialist principles they cannot be made to meet it. For those principles deny God, they hold the ordinances of society to be unwarranted and unjust, and they regard the laws of nature as fluid instead of fixed and a hindrance to man only because of his ignorance, fear, and abasement, induced through the artificial restraints imposed by religion, the family, and the State.

Therefore, the Socialist politic to revolutionize society to the point where there will be "not a government of *persons* but an administration of *things*," appears as a menace to human welfare, threatening the permanence of society, making for the destruction of civilization, if not of the human race.

II. RECONSTRUCTION

But it is claimed that Socialism is reconstructive as well as revolutionary, and that its reconstructive aims go to make up its politic, are inseparable from its revolutionary proposals, and will be worked out simultaneously with them. That is to say, while the present order of society is to be overthrown, a new order is to take its place, and this momentous change will be effected by a gradual process of evolution, of which the Socialist political movement is the expression. It is claimed that this change is actually in process now as a result of the contradictory or negative forces that present so-

ciety has generated; that for many years this change has been more or less perceptible, but of late it has become unmistakably obvious.

In support of these claims it is pointed out that governments the world over are gradually extending their authority over affairs hitherto regarded as private and free from governmental control, and at the same time the governments are becoming more responsive to the will of the people. Moreover, it is urged, the marked tendency of modern industry is Socialistic in character, though not in purpose, as is evidenced by the great combinations that have become common in modern business. Now Socialism as a politic, it is finally urged, has for its ultimate aim the uniting of all lines of industry into one combination and the management of the combination by the government and the control of the government by the working people, who will be the only stockholders in the combination and will thus direct its operations for their own benefit and will receive its products without any diminution being made by a few capitalists exacting rents, interest, dividends, and other forms of profit. In other words, "the making of goods for profit shall come to an end"; but this can be effected only by the "organization of society upon an industrial basis," which means "the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange."

To be somewhat more definite, we quote from Hillquit's *Socialism Summed Up*, chapter, "Aims of Socialism": "The Socialist program requires the public or collective ownership and operation of the principal instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth—the land, mines, railroads, steamboats,

telegraph and telephone lines, mills, factories and modern machinery. This is the main program and the ultimate aim of the whole Socialist movement and the political creed of all Socialists. It is the unfailing test of Socialist adherence and admits of no limitation, extension or variation. Whoever accepts this program is a Socialist, whoever does not is not." In almost the same language do all Socialist leaders and propagandists and all official platforms, national and international, define the aim of Socialist politics—"public ownership and operation of the instruments for the production and distribution of wealth."

This aim has a twofold aspect. In so much as it proposes that the public shall own the instruments of wealth, it is chiefly a politic. But in so much as it proposes the collective operation of those instruments, it is chiefly an economic. Only the political aspect will be treated in this chapter, the other being deferred for a subsequent chapter.

Two important questions are involved in the political aspect: (1) exactly what is it proposed that the public shall own? (2) precisely how will the things determined on be acquired by the public? We say "exactly" and "precisely" with studied purpose; these questions are pre-eminently practical and the last detail is important.

(1)

As to exactly what it is proposed that the public shall own there is a diversity of opinion among Socialists that is not warranted by their economic principle. Hillquit limits the general scope of public ownership to the

"*principal* instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth." Then he specifies: "the land, mines, railroads, steamboats, telegraph and telephone lines, mills, factories and modern machinery." He adds the dogmatic statement that this program "admits of no limitation, extension or variation." But it is obvious that Hillquit would not be bound by the eight particulars he mentions. There are many means for producing and distributing wealth that are not comprised in this category, among them some of the most reprehensible known to modern industry. Hillquit evidently mentions these eight only by way of a suggestion and not as a specification of the "principal instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth."

The diversity mentioned as existing among Socialists arises from the use of the word "*principal*" to specify what means for production and distribution shall be owned. The word does not occur in this connection in the Communist Manifesto or any other official utterance of Socialists, nor in the writings of Marx or Engels or others among the classical authorities of Socialism. Its use probably was first suggested by Spargo, in 1906, as a result of the vigorous assertion of the right of private property by "captive critics" and to avoid the point of their opposition to the Socialist aim. But Spargo, unlike Hillquit, refrained from the use of the word, because "it would cause confusion to readers rather than prove enlightening, since it would convey no *exact* meaning to their minds."¹ Since the Manifesto specifies "*all* instruments of production" as included, and practically all other Socialists than Hillquit and Spargo unquali-

¹ *The Socialists, Who They Are and What They Stand For*, 78.

fiedly define their aim to be "the socialization of *the* means of production, distribution, and exchange," the Socialist orthodoxy of the qualification "*principal*" is open to question.

When making the suggestion above noted, Spargo adroitly remarks: "To avoid captious criticism, it is admitted that Socialism does not involve the ownership of *all* means of production, distribution, and exchange." This admission is about as satisfactory as would be that of one accused of a crime who *admitted* he was not guilty. To determine fairly the issue raised by the Hillquit-Spargo and the Marx-Engels teachings on this point, we must refer to their economic principle. This principle ascribes all the evils in the universe to the "profit-idea" or the use of labor-power to produce surplus value. Therefore the logical aim of Socialism is to put an end to the control of labor-power by another than the laborer, to abolish the relations of master and servant, of employer and employe, of capitalist and workingman in whatever form. But these relations are a consequence of one person owning property that another wants to use. Therefore, to accomplish the aim of Socialism, the public must acquire ownership, not necessarily in all the means producing and distributing wealth, nor yet merely in the principal ones, but in all *property* that a person can own while it is used to his advantage by another. Whatsoever the kind of property or thing, if it can be used with profit or advantage to the owner by another than the owner, the Socialist economic requires that the ownership of the individual be terminated.

Of course, in the accomplishment of this purpose, the *principal* instruments for production and distribution

would be the first to be acquired by Socialists, since they conceive these to be the most effective in the "system of labor-exploitation." But that would only limit and would not stop the exploitation. Those who still owned property that others could use would only redouble their efforts to make profits by what was left to them, and sooner or later *all* the means not only for the production and distribution of wealth, but for the exploitation of labor-power,—*all things* that one person could own and secure advantage with when it was used by another, would have to be acquired by the collective body.

In arguing that the ownership of all means for production is not contemplated by Socialists, Spargo instances "spades, wheelbarrows, jack-knives, etc.," as means of production that "it is ridiculous to suppose that they would want to institute public ownership and control of; and so, too, with the artist's brushes, the small farmer's farm, and a hundred other things, the socialization of which would be impossible and too absurd for anything but *opera bouffe* if it were possible." There will be few to differ from Spargo's conclusion that such a thing is impossible, and if it were merely "supposed" that this is the aim of Socialism, it would be a ridiculous supposition indeed. If Socialists do not want to do this thing, as Spargo implies, it is proof that they are not willing to stand by their principles. In contemplation of the Socialist economic not even a jack-knife can be owned. For the owner at so much per unit of time could hire another to use this simple instrument—to make smoking pipes out of cast-off corn-cobs, let us say, which he could sell at a profit, and thus rob the poor workingman of the fruits of his toil. But if this could

be done with a jack-knife, what could not be done with "the small farmer's farm"? Is it not true that many of our money kings have begun with means quite as simple as a jack-knife? Do Socialists intend to set an all-seeing eye to watch over the career of each individual and say to him: "Thus far and no farther"?

If the Socialist principle of economics were sound, if the theory of surplus value were true, if the class-struggle idea were borne out by the facts of life, nothing short of collective ownership of everything that it is possible for one to own while another uses, could remedy existing evils. Such unquestionably was the view of earlier Socialists, is the meaning of their economic, and probably is understood by most Socialists to-day to be the aim of their politic.

But while probably as yet the view of the minority only, the Hillquit-Spargo teaching on this point is rapidly winning favor among Socialists, partly because it is a more tactical teaching since it seems to avoid the criticism that Socialism would abolish property, and partly because there has fallen in among Socialists a property-owning class that has some measure of regard for the right of property. If the increase of Socialists continues along this line, it is not improbable that the Hillquit-Spargo view will become that of the majority.

While this change of purpose seems — though it only seems — to avoid the criticism that Socialism denies the right of property, it is fairly overwhelmed with the difficulty foreseen by Spargo in determining the "exact meaning" of the word principal as used in connection with the means of production and distribution that the collective body must acquire. At the risk of being

tedious we are disposed to pursue this important matter to the last detail, but shall only try the patience of the reader to the extent of examining the eight particulars mentioned by Hillquit in his specifications of what Socialists propose to own collectively.

"The land." Is all land included? Then Spargo is in error when he says that "it is inconceivable that the Socialists will ever attempt to take away the small farmer's farm" (*The Socialists*, 79). The 1908 platform specified "all land," but that of 1912 only "land wherever practicable" (another phrase having no "exact" meaning, by the way). Here we have all land, the principal land, and land wherever practicable included in the land to be collectively owned, then an additional qualification excepting the small farmer's farm. And how *small* would be the small farmer's farm? Does "the land" include city property,—skyscrapers, big apartment houses, great tenements,—private residences, the modest cottage with the stately mansion? If the line be drawn with the actual residence of the owner—and where else might it be if "rents" are to be abolished as a form of surplus value—then, what about vacant rooms in such residences? Could they be rented, or must they stand idle, or will the owner be required to apply for a new residence when there happens a marriage or a death in his family? There are literally "a thousand and one" questions pertinent here, and they are practical questions that would mean a positive degree of happiness or of misery in the way they are answered if Socialism is ever anything more than a dream.

"Mines." Are all mines included? In the coal fields there are thousands of small strip-pits where only pick

and shovel are necessary to extract the black diamonds, and these serve as the only means of livelihood to many people and as a great source of comfort to many more who are able to buy only the inferior coal generally derived from this source. Something like this holds with respect to all other minerals. Taken all in all, it is no exaggeration to say that there are hundreds of thousands for whom their proprietary rights in "mines" of one kind or another are their only means of subsistence, but who in the sense of being capitalists must be classed with the smallest of small farmers,—will these be deprived against their will of ownership in their property? If so, it is a pity; but if not, then what mines is it proposed that the public shall acquire?

"Railroads, steamboats, telegraph and telephone lines."

In the State of Indiana there is a railroad upon which one may ride the length of its lines for 25 cents. For six dollars one may charter a special train for the round trip over its "system." It is presumable that if wheelbarrows are not to be acquired by the public, this railroad also would be excepted. But there are many railroads that are scarcely more of an "octopus" than this one, and which are the property of workingmen, if that term includes all who must work in order to live. Upon all the rivers of the country are to be found various kinds of floating vessels, many of which are the sole means of livelihood for their owners. Perhaps these would not be called "steamboats," but they are as nearly such as the great barges and scows that are owned by rich capitalists. Within the last decade or so in all parts of the country there have been "neighborhood" telephone lines constructed, and their number is

increasing rapidly, though they are operated at a loss. Now, are railroads, steamboats, and telephone lines such as these to be acquired by the Socialist State? Surely not. But where will the line be drawn? We have only touched the question; for between the highly developed "systems" and the crude "independents" that exist in these industries, there is a countless variety of mixed forms in which they are carried on, and it is necessary to know just where Socialists propose to call a halt in their absorption by The Great State.

And of the remaining particulars in Hillquit's category this is equally true. In "*mills, factories, and modern machinery*," the same all but infinite variety in forms of industrial activity and development obtains; and so in all other industries that might by construction or amendment be included in or added to the list. In how far they are to be absorbed or left free by the proposed new order, is a question that cannot be avoided if the Socialist proposals are to be considered at all. Whether Socialism will be ushered in by imperceptible accretion, by easy stages or by sudden violence, the acquisition of industries by the collective body must begin somewhere, and somewhere stop, and the inevitable question is—where? And the inevitable result of the question is, not an answer, but confusion. There is confusion among the proponents of Socialism, and worse confusion among their followers, and when this question is submitted to the whole people to be decided, as is proposed, what with perhaps a thousand industries to classify and with as many questions of detail to be answered for each one, there will be confusion such as never before existed in the world. It would be difficult to afflict society with

a greater evil than the state of chaotic confusion that must certainly result when the people come to consider the broad field of industry and life and determine what instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth, short of the whole, it is necessary or desirable for them to own.

(2)

Granting that it would somehow be determined what property the public should acquire, how will the acquisition be effected? As to this question, also, there exists a diversity of opinion among Socialists. One says they will be confiscated; another says they will be acquired by competition; another says the owners will be induced to give them up in exchange for pensions; another says they will be purchased outright. With his usual directness, Bax says: "If the question is How? the answer is, How you can." A Socialist, N. A. Richardson, has written a book especially treating of this question: *Methods of Acquiring Our Industries*. He mentions the four methods of confiscation, competition, pension, and purchase, and says: "No others have been suggested, doubtless because there are no others; that our industries must be acquired through application of one or more of these methods is apparent to all students of the subject."

The confiscation method is very simple: all owners of property that the State wants will be dispossessed summarily and without compensation. This method is the only one that is consistent with Socialist principles. In its support, Richardson says (*op. cit.*, 4); "We contend that all value is the creature of labor,—that labor alone

can create value. That which is created of right belongs to the creator. To confiscate the means of production is at its worst but appropriating to public use that which has been appropriated to private use—but confiscating the confiscator—but giving back to the producer that which has been filched from him by process of law.” But confiscation is so repugnant to the sense of common justice obtaining among all law abiding people that Socialists have been compelled to suggest other methods as a matter of expediency, and hence, some of them advocate the competitive method.

This method is not so simple as the other. It contemplates the State entering the field of industry and competing with capitalists; the government would conduct its enterprises without profit, and this would put an end to the dividends of private enterprises and their owners would abandon them in consequence. The advocates of confiscation call this method an “artful dodge.” They argue that, while they propose to confiscate the property, their dissenting comrades would confiscate the value of the property. “What is the difference,” they add by way of a query, “between taking my property and taking from it all value as property? Are you not plainly trying to mislead by juggling with words?” (*op. cit.*, 12). It may be said further: not only is this method a kind of confiscation, but it would be more foolish and more cruel than plain confiscation: more foolish because it calls for a needless expenditure in building up the competing enterprises and in maintaining them until their object is accomplished; more cruel because the owners of the enterprises whose destruction is determined upon will themselves be required to help establish and support

the enterprises that are directed against them with deadly purpose. Moreover, this method is not practicable. To conduct a public enterprise so as to prevent private enterprises from making profits, is a proposition offering so many difficulties that its undertaking on anything like a general plan is altogether unwarranted; while perhaps one is hardly justified in saying this could not be done, it is wholly gratuitous to say that it could be; experiment alone would determine. But experiment in a single line of industry would not suffice for all. There are productive, extractive, constructive, distributive industries, to mention only these, each requiring different kinds as well as different degrees of skill and intelligence in its operation, each having its peculiar "technique" and each subject to different laws and conditions that are beyond human control or regulation. This method, therefore, apart from its pronounced injustice, is so much involved that all prudent persons must withhold from it their sanction. As compared with the confiscation method it has little to distinguish it in effect and nothing to give it preference in application.

The third method suggested offers to provide a life-pension for the owners of property the public would acquire. The orthodox Socialist objects to this method because "these pensions must be paid from labor's product; and why should labor, that has already contributed its countless millions for the support of the idle rich, continue to make donations for that purpose?" (*op. cit.*, 28). It is objectionable to the non-Socialist because it claims a birthright for a mess of pottage; contrary to Portia's classic utterance, it would season, not justice but injustice, with mercy; confiscation outright

would be far preferable to this mock charity that all self-respecting persons would scorn to accept in lieu of what is to most of them their hardly earned fortune. The impracticability of this scheme renders it further objectionable. While perhaps a few thousand persons own, say one-half the property that would be acquired, the other half is owned by many millions. There are comparatively few persons who do not own some interest in the property whose acquisition would be necessary, and if all the owners are to be pensioned for life, or for a time, it is open to question whether there would be enough left to operate a single line of industry on a national scale. So unless the pensioners were required to work — and then of what benefit would a pension be? — our great systems of industry would be paralyzed with the application of this method. It cannot be profitably contended in this connection that those who would be pensioned are “the idle rich.” Truth to say, but few of the rich are idle; idleness and riches are scarce more companionable than the proverbial “fool and his money.” An overwhelming majority of the persons under consideration are neither rich nor idle; at best, they are only well-to-do; many of them are poor; they are practically all workers, among the most industrious and the most thrifty people in the land. In the steam railroad companies of the United States, not to mention electric roads, there are nearly five hundred thousand stockholders; to say that ten per cent. of these are rich would be far too much; to say one per cent. are idle would be an exaggeration; one per cent. doubtless would include all of the first class, while the second is too insignificant to consider. But if in the acquisition of a single line of

industry practically a half million workers are to be put upon a pension, who can doubt that the wheels of industry will slow down, if they do not stop, when the owners in all of the "principal" industries are made recipients of the public bounty?

Acquisition by purchase is the fourth method suggested. It brings in a whole train of difficulties. Of first importance is the question of price. Who will fix the price the State must pay for stocks, securities, railroads, land, timber, mines, smelters, refineries, mills, factories, farms, shops, machinery, houses, material, etc., etc.? The present owners could not in reason be permitted to fix the price; the purchaser could not in justice be permitted to do it; there is no encouragement to believe the two could agree on a price. But "purchase" means paying a fair price, and here is a serious difficulty for Socialists. A still more serious difficulty is that of payment. If adequate prices are to be paid for all the property acquired, bonds must issue, for there is not enough money in the whole world to pay for the principal industries in a single modern country; it is doubtful if there is enough gold and silver in the world which, made into money, would meet this emergency without debasing the coinage, and that would only be a species of confiscation. But to issue bonds for the unheard-of sum that would have to be paid would be to saddle upon the public a debt that it must stagger under. During the existence of this debt the relations of the two classes it would create in society would be intolerable. The persons who are now propertyless would be virtually slaves under the yoke of this obligation. The persons who now have property would constitute a bond-

holding aristocracy, surpassing in its power and its possibilities all the aristocracies that have been. Nor is there any assurance that this state of affairs would be speedily ended. The property that it would be necessary for the public to acquire, putting it at the minimum, represents the capitalized energies of many generations; and though due allowance be made for the increased productivity of modern methods of industry, it will require many generations to come to produce the tremendous values represented so as to purchase what is necessary at a fair price. Moreover, as fast as these values were paid over to the bondholders, they would be reinvested, and the conditions the first purchase was made to abolish would again arise, and repeated purchases and repeated bonding would be necessary until there no longer existed any property for investment. So long as money is considered as having purchasing power, the grip of the property-owning classes on society cannot be loosed by any scheme that pays over to them value for value the price of their holdings, and in this light acquisition by purchase appears as an impossible proposal. But if money be considered as losing its purchasing power, whether suddenly or gradually, whether in the sense that it is itself debased or in the sense that nothing remains for its investment, the proposal to acquire property by "purchase" appears to be a shallow pretense, not to say an "artful dodge."

(a) *A Comment.*

Whether or not the four methods of acquisition examined are the only ones that have been proposed, they are the only ones that it is necessary to examine. All supposable methods are reducible to two general classes:

confiscatory and compensatory; and one or the other or a combination of the two clearly must be adopted. It may not be said with assurance which of these is in greater favor among Socialists. To judge from their popular propaganda of late years, it seems that the compensatory method claims the more uniform adherence among them; but to judge from earlier propaganda and from the Socialist fundamentals, it is clear that the confiscatory method is truer to their purpose. Distinguishing Socialism from Socialists, whether it be considered as a science or as a politic, it must result in confiscation or else fail of result. Not only does Socialist philosophy, as economically expressed, require this; but, in spite of tactical expressions to the contrary, one can hardly escape the conviction that the underlying sentiment demands it, and it is certain that the physical facts bearing on the question make it necessary.

Not that confiscation could be effected without great difficulty; to say that it would not be attended with strife and bloodshed is to say more than human nature warrants us to believe; to say that the capitalists who are accused of having built up a perverted civilization for the protection of their interests, will suffer their interests to be ruined while they still control their power, is to impute to them a character that belies the central theme of the whole Socialist movement.

But, though involving difficulties, the confiscatory method does not involve complications. It is marked by its directness and simplicity, and if the right of property can once be effaced from the human conscience, the force of numbers can be relied on to put it into effect. Hence, it is pertinently observed by La Monte that "re-

spect for the 'sacred rights of private property' is the stone wall against which every Socialist agitator is continually ramming his long suffering head." And hence, the "Great Revolution," which destroys religion, family, State, and private property, must be brought to its final term before the first signal effort at Socialist reconstruction can be undertaken, before public ownership in the means for production, distribution, and exchange can reasonably be expected.

That this is a remote, not to say impossible, contingency has already been observed. But this is not a forbidding aspect to Socialists, in whose philosophy nothing is impossible but a continuance of the present order of society. They confidently look forward to the time when "to speak of private property will be regarded by all intelligent persons as absurd and ridiculous;" and while in their platforms and their programs they make many specific demands that are plausible, and some that, taken alone, are not to be condemned, the public is strictly cautioned that these "are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole powers of government and take hold of the whole system of industry and thus come into their rightful inheritance," viz: the accumulated wealth of the world. How they would use this vast acquisition is matter for treatment under the head of Socialism as an economic movement.

CHAPTER THREE

AS AN ECONOMIC MOVEMENT

I. THE OPERATION OF INDUSTRY

The Great Revolution being accomplished, and the means for the production, distribution and exchange of goods in society being collectively owned, Socialists would undertake the work of operating them. This is the aim of the Socialist economic. This is the distinctive feature of Socialism considered as a proposed society.

If mere collective ownership were the extent of the Socialist aim, it would not excite grave apprehension, provided no enforced privation of natural right were threatened. Truth to say, the ultimate title of all property is now recognized as being in the State; if one dies without heirs one's property escheats, if one uses property unlawfully it may be confiscated, if it is necessary for public use it may be condemned; escheat, confiscation, and eminent domain are rights of the State that, in addition to the right of taxation, all civilized countries have recognized and enforced since the time of the Romans, the Greeks, Moses, Hammurapi.

But collective operation is a different matter. Upon the operation or use of property the human race depends, and prudence dictates the closest scrutiny of the methods proposed for the collective operation of the principal

means for producing and distributing wealth. If one be indifferent to justice and right, and notably credulous, details about the establishment of Socialisdom may not be required; but it is impossible that one not wholly blind, and in a way perverted, can be content to efface society without first learning in detail how human existence is to be afterwards secured. The fact that no society in history ever undertook to operate the means for producing and distributing wealth does not lessen the importance of such an enquiry. The fact that hundreds of small communities have undertaken this with the result that not one of them now exists, marks it as all the more imperative.

Socialists treat this question in a curious way. They indulge in the most extravagant platitudes imaginable. They say that "Socialism would inaugurate a new era of mechanical progress, the possibilities of which are undreamed of to-day,"¹ that "the time will come when the work of the world will be done by simply pressing a button,"² that in Socialisdom "all would have leisure and be educated; all would be free, and happiness would reign supreme,"³ that "Socialism will realize the golden age of peace, plenty and justice for all,"⁴ that "it will bring heaven back from the clouds of mythology to the earth of men and the Sahara of to-day will become an Eden where the sweet spirit of Comradeship shall blossom forth like the fabled rose of unfading beauty,"⁵

¹ *The Principles of Scientific Socialism*, Vail, 226.

² *Ib.*, 198.

³ *Why a Woman Should be a Socialist*, Wiltshire, 22.

⁴ *The Socialist Movement*, Vail, 31.

⁵ *Where We Stand*, Spargo, 22.

that "every child will have a better education than the children of millionaires have now,"⁶ that "every child would be born into the world as the immediate inheritor of all the resources of nature and history, of art and science, of industry and society, of inspiration and culture,"⁷ and "then for the first time man will be finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom and emerge from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones,"⁸ and "there will be nothing that the human heart can long for that it will not have and nothing that the human mind can conceive that it will not understand."⁹

All this is very delightful, but it misses the question. What we want to know is, how will the operation of industry be conducted in Socialisdom? If we lay stress on this question the Socialists should be the last to object, for it is they who teach with greatest emphasis that the material means of subsistence is the only object in life worth while, and certainly this will not be forthcoming unless industry be carried on properly.

The question has two main aspects: (1), as to the Division of labor, and (2), as to the Direction of labor, and they call for separate treatment.

1. *As to the Division of Labor.*

How will labor be divided in Socialisdom? Who will fill the positions of honor? Who will be given desirable occupations? Who will perform the drudgery? Of course, when "the work of the world will be done by simply pressing a button," such questions will not be per-

⁶, ⁷ *Folly of Being Good*, Kerr, cf. 17-20.

⁸ *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, Engels, 134.

⁹ "Thesen," Stern, cf. 25-43.

tinent, and if dreams must come true, Bebel's "scientists in countless numbers" doubtless will be able to devise this Aladdin's-lamp-like device. But one is tempted to think it will require a little time to do this; what about the meantime? Lewis tells us that Curvier's theory of cataclysmic evolution is repudiated by the Socialists; Ladoff says that "advanced Socialist thinkers do not expect any sudden transformation of society;" hence, when contemplating the rapturous prospect of the Socialist paradise, one may venture to think that possibly a generation will pass "before all these things be done;" and it should scarce be accounted a "mark of ignorance" if one diffidently inquire how the necessities of life will be provided during the interim.

One answer to the question of dividing labor is very pleasing. It is said: "Each one will determine for himself in what occupation he wishes to be employed."¹⁰ Under such an arrangement doubtless all attractive positions would be filled, but how about the "hewers of wood and drawers of water"? Would there be persons so thirsting for self-abasement that they would voluntarily select repulsive, dirty, blood-sweating occupations in preference to all others? Even Bebel could not believe this, and lest he be accused of such folly, he advances a scheme to *compel* the performance of disagreeable work.

"At stated intervals," says Bebel (*op. cit.*, 271 sq.), "according to a fixed rotation, all members of a certain department, without distinction of sex, shall undertake all functions. . . . Large, comfortable, and perfectly equipped workshops will make easy for all persons the

¹⁰ *Woman*, Bebel, 335. Cf. also, "Thesen," Stern, 37; *Social Democracy*, Kohler, 61; Kautsky, *Social Revolution*.

learning of all trades and will introduce them to practice as though it were in play." This seems to be a kind of Kindergarten plan, except that it is coercive, "fixed." It would be interesting to know how the rotations are to be thus prescribed when there will not be a "government of persons." But granting it would be done, then all persons, "without distinction of sex," would in their turn become ditch-diggers, street-cleaners, hod-carriers, hostlers, scavengers, and so forth, not voluntarily, but in "fixed" order. It is difficult to credit Bebel with the belief that under such a plan "countless numbers of scientists and scholars" would arise, when perhaps in the midst of his crowning experiment the chemist would be sent to cart off refuse, or with his patient's life hanging by a thread, the doctor would be set to work with pick and shovel, while the blacksmith and the butcher, it may be, would be summoned to take their places; when the brick-layer might be substituted for the architect, the mortar-mixer for the mural decorator, the janitor for the pedagogue, the "devil" for the editor, etc., etc. Indeed to one who is aware of the time, the labor, the patience, the privation, the repeated trials, the repeated failures, the multiplied hardships that go to make up skilled proficiency in any trade or profession, Bebel's rotation plan seems so nonsensical that it is hard to be persuaded that its advocates are altogether free from censurable motives in suggesting it.

Other plans have been suggested. In *Looking Backward*, Bellamy suggests two that appear to be widely favored among Socialists. In the first of these it is supposed that all persons will apply for the work most to their choice; but if the number of applicants for one

occupation be too many, and those for another too few, the labor-time of the one would be lengthened and that of the other shortened until a suitable division is effected. That is to say, by imposing a burden on the naturally desirable occupations that would render them more forbidding than those naturally forbidding, the happy citizens of Socialisdom, compelled to work, would choose the least of two evils and *voluntarily* engage in pursuits for which they had no liking. It is safe to say that not every one is able to discern the irresistible charm in an arrangement so felicitous; and evidently Bellamy feared as much when, like Bebel, he suggested a second scheme.

According to the second, if, notwithstanding the careful regulation of labor-time, there should still be too few applicants for the drudgery work, the "authorities" would declare some special honor for such as take up the neglected occupations; *e.g.*, "they would be proclaimed deserving of the gratitude of the entire country." This plan of the brilliant novelist does not evince the genius of the first. It contradicts the Socialist teaching that there will be no classes or class distinctions in the new society. It admits too much by admitting that Socialism may reduce the majority of persons to so sad a plight that, contrary to the truth, they would be willing to proclaim their occupations less honorable than those so mean that they had been declined for their repulsiveness. It assumes too much in assuming that there will ever be persons simple enough to be deceived by a subterfuge so manifest; even the Great Revolution will scarcely change the prevailing belief in the physical fact that "The rose by any other name will smell as sweet."

Another plan often suggested, sometimes as a substi-

tute for, and sometimes in connection with, the labor-time plan, is to regulate the pay for labor according to the attractiveness or the repugnancy of the occupation, the most attractive affording the least and the most repugnant the greatest pay, so that the scavenger's job likely would be the most lucrative in society. But, aside from the striking injustice of this plan and its stultifying effect upon the individual aspirations that make for uplift, of what benefit to the workman would be his increased reward? He could not consistently be permitted to acquire more property than he could use, and in common with all other citizens, he would be entitled to all he could use if he showed a willingness to work regardless of the kind of labor he performed; what inducement, therefore, would be a higher wage for him to undertake the most repulsive duties in preference to the most attractive?

It is suggested by some Socialists, who doubtless realize that no plan yet imagined even approaches a solution of the difficulty, that it is unnecessary to solve it because it will solve itself with the advent of Socialism. Three inconsistent reasons are assigned for this conclusion on their part. It is said first, that owing to the rapid invention of new mechanical power and processes, all disagreeable work will be performed by machinery; second, that public opinion will be so powerful that no person can withstand its impulses, and since the need for workers in any occupation would be reflected by public opinion, the response on the part of citizens would automatically correspond, and there would never be too many or too few applicants in any occupation; finally, that human nature will be so ennobled that selfishness will not

exist, and instead of being all centered in his own petty affairs, each person will be absorbed with the affairs of society and consumed with the desire to serve society's interests, and no occupation will be *thought* forbidding if the interests of society make it necessary. Spargo, Kautsky, and Morris are chief among those who have made these random guesses. They scarce deserve comment. They are too obviously the outcome of a hopeless situation to be taken seriously. They are so contrary to the common observation and experience of mankind, that only a mind in desperate straits would think of them.

But supposing that, through some inducement or by some force not exactly definable, the enviable citizens of Socialisdom will become eager, or at least willing, to undertake any occupation assigned to them, then we must consider the question: How would it be determined what number of workmen would be needed in a particular industry of a certain section at a given time? To put this in the concrete: How would it be learned what number of men — and women, be it marked — would be required during the autumn season to mine the necessary coal from the various fields in the country? If too many workmen are set at this task, other industries must suffer, and if too few, the people would fall victims to the cold of winter. It may not be said that the supply of labor necessary in Socialisdom could be gauged from present conditions. For under these the coal industry is regulated by competition in every detail, — the miner, the operator, the carrier, the dealer, the drayman, the consumer, are in keen competition with others of the same class. And we may expect that, when competition is abolished, the consumer will not be quite so economi-

cal, the drayman not quite so diligent, the dealer not quite so considerate, the carrier not quite so prompt, the miner not quite so energetic, the operator not quite so farseeing, and that on the whole there will be a marked difference in the supply of labor required to operate this line of industry to the eminent satisfaction of all the people; and when it is considered, also, that women are to be given places beside the men, and that perhaps all workers will be rotated according to some plan or other, it appears there will be so considerable a difference that present conditions would not furnish the remotest basis for a calculation in the matter.

What in this respect is true of the coal industry and of other extractive industries, is also true of the manufacturing industries, and perhaps in a more startling degree. Consider the manufacture of cotton cloth. There are the planting and the cultivation of the cotton crop, the gathering of the bolls, the ginning and baling of the raw material, the cleaning, carding and spinning, the weaving, dyeing and stamping; then the distribution to the various sections where needed. Next must follow the fashioning of the cloth for use in compliance with the requirements of consumers, the selecting, patterning, cutting, sewing, fitting, trimming. What imaginable method of dividing the labor force of the country would comprehend all of these various functions and processes and so distribute the laborers that there would be neither too many nor too few connected with any phase of the industry?

We have only touched upon one item each in two of the elemental necessities of life, which comprise numerous items, and we find the difficulties of dividing the

labor force by arbitrary rule to be insurmountable. If we consider the production of food in all of its numberless varieties and forms, we see those difficulties multiplied, and the bare existence of mankind becomes involved with uncertainty and doubt. The necessity for providing adequate shelter for all persons increases the difficulties and makes the case all the more hopeless in its impossibilities. And yet, we have only considered the matters of food, fuel, clothes, and shelter, saying nothing of the endless catalogue of things other than these which must be provided in modern civilized life and which are not wholly wanting nowadays among the poorest. Can any person trust the solution of these difficulties, which involve the security of future generations, if not our own, to those who do nothing but loudly affirm that "Socialism will provide such an abundance of all things as never existed in the world," without bringing upon himself the just criticism of being wantonly reckless of his own as well as society's interests? Will any person suffer himself to be turned away in confusion from an examination of this question by the complacent assertion of Socialists that it is a mark of ignorance to ask for details?

2. *As to the Direction of Labor.*

But if it be granted that, through some plan not yet imagined, the division of labor will be effected satisfactorily in Socialisdom, there arises the further question: How will it be directed? No doubt the direction of labor will then be as necessary as it is now. Direction is necessary to the simplest motion; there is no human action that is not directed by the human brain. So long as the act of one person has no immediate connection

with that of another, one's own brain directs the act. But when the acts of two or more persons are connected in their immediate and expected consequences, the direction of another than the actor comes into play. A forger, in making a tool for his own use, requires no superintendent; but one making a part for a machine of many parts, the other parts of which are being made by others, must follow the direction of the master mechanic. No amount of intelligence or good intention on the part of the workmen can dispense with the necessity for directivity in production, and it is of the utmost importance to know how Socialists would provide this essential in their proposed society.

One very simple plan is proposed by them: "The laborers of each department will choose their own superintendents," says Bebel (*op. cit.*, 335). But this is not practical. Laborers are not capable of judging the two necessary qualifications of competency and reliability in directors. Nor, indeed, is any class of persons capable of doing this. Directive ability is a peculiar gift; it is not easily defined or described, and it is rarely if ever discerned except by its achievements. Mere executive ability perhaps could safely be left to the selection of the workmen, but this falls short of a solution of the difficulty. When it is said that laborers will choose their own superintendents, if it is meant only that they will select their own taskmasters, it is very little to say, but if more than this is meant, it is too much to say. Suppose, by way of applying this plan, that a number of factories, warehouses, etc., is to be erected in various sections of Socialisdom. There would be required for this work a superintendent of construction, an engineer, an architect,

a master mechanic, and various other heads of departments; there would also be required like functionaries for that part of the work in each section. Not considering the ordinary taskmasters, the number of superiors required for such an undertaking would be exceedingly great, and the most trying demagogue would hardly advance the contention that their selection could prudently be left with the choice of the laborers. How, then, would they be selected? Granting it could be done in the one instance, what if at the same time a vast irrigation project were undertaken, a great field for reclamation service were reopened, a large plan of reforestation were to be carried out, an extensive line of railroad were to be laid, an interminable network of metal roads were to be built,—would the same authority be required to determine the competency and the reliability of the countless directive functionaries necessary for these enterprises?

But it is needless to enter into speculation as to the direction of these enterprises that Socialists set out as desirable and as part of their program. The mere duty of carrying on production so as to sustain the various lines of industry on their present scale offers enough difficulty, without anticipating industrial expansion. To accomplish this very necessary task would involve the exercise of the most tremendous powers, calling for the highest degree of knowledge, skill, judgment, tact. It is foolish to talk about the whole people selecting the directive superintendents of industry. It would be dangerous to our liberties to constitute a commission for this purpose. Its power would be a power for evil as well as for good, and before a prudent people would constitute it, some

assurance would be required that this unprecedented power would not be used for evil as well as for good. This assurance is not forthcoming. We commend the words of the Socialist, H. G. Wells, in this connection: "Any step towards a collective organization of society may be a step toward the control of our lives by a narrow-minded, cramping, tyrannous, and in all probability dishonest bureaucracy. It is idle to pretend that this probability has been in any way disposed of by the Socialist. It has not. The contemporary Socialist has still to show that such a tyranny is improbable. As a Socialist, I think he can do so, but I do not think he has done so." (*Social Democracy*, H. G. Wells, 21.) This candid writer then proceeds to outline what he imagines to be a satisfactory guaranty against Socialist tyranny, and a contemporary Socialist says that no man who understands liberty or toleration could live in the society he describes; "it would be hell."

But passing the danger to human liberty involved in the lodgment of this incomprehensible power in the hands of less than the whole people, let us consider more closely its effect not on human happiness but on human existence. It may be said that if this plan would infallibly make for greater efficiency in production, doubtless there are not a few who would be willing to risk its transgressions of their liberties, trusting to the "womb of time" to bring forth some expedient to safeguard them. But if it appears that under such a fearful power not only human liberty would be insecure but human life would be uncertain, it is not to be supposed that even the malcontents of existing society would wittingly invite the change proposed.

Human life is uncertain where the production of the necessities of life is not assured. This cannot be assured where the efficiency that directs the process of production is doubtful. The chief consideration at this point, therefore, is not the honesty or the good intentions of the central authority in Socialisdom, but its ability. It must have the ability to select competent and reliable, and in many cases highly specialised and specially gifted directors, managers, superintendents,—not in just one or two or several, but in all lines of industry. It must have the ability to discern and judge of ability and to determine the highest order of ability obtainable,—not in one person, one profession or one occupation, but in all. Moreover, it must be able to secure the application in its highest efficiency of the ability it determines upon. Nothing short of this can secure that degree of efficiency which on the whole characterizes the present process of production, less than which would result in want if not starvation for people beyond number. Such an authority could not be constituted. The known limitations of human capacity forbid any other conclusion being in all sincerity reached.

But a contrary view is expressed by Socialists. They affirm that “it is altogether useless to say that an enterprise cannot be managed by society when it is being managed by a group of capitalists.” (Vail’s *Principles*, 27.) This statement misses the point. Capitalists are not efficient because they are capitalists; they are capitalists, as a rule, because they are efficient. So, the members of a group acting as a unit are not efficient because they act as a unit; they act as a unit because they are efficient. Observation and experience remove all doubt on this

score. Capitalists, both large and small, fail; they fail singly and in groups; they fail, not for lack of capital or of co-operation, but for lack of competent and reliable management in their business. Lack of co-operation may be an occasion for their failure and lack of capital a test, but neither is ever a cause. In the last analysis, all unsuccessful enterprises are unsuccessful for the want in some particular of thorough directive ability. The particular may not be definitely known, even to the insolvent, of whom it is not uncommonly said, "he was broke before he knew it"; but the invariable law of competition is to eliminate the unfit from the industrial field and to yield to the fit exactly that measure of control they are fitted to sustain.

Competition unfailingly registers, in all their bearings, the mistakes and the shortcomings of each person within its domain, and with stern precision it assesses the penalty of financial loss for each delinquency suffered to exist. So long as the delinquent can bear his repeated losses, he remains in the field, but when the penalties have exhausted his resources, he is automatically eliminated. Since the capital of all individuals is limited, competition thus sooner or later infallibly ejects the unfit from the field of industry and gradually brings its direction and control to the highest state of efficiency compatible with human nature.

This efficiency is not personal; it is characteristic. It is not the birthright of any one, or of any class, but is the unerring mark and measure of thorough-going ability which is only discernible when brought out by effort and achievement. Hence, it follows, that in Socialism, where there would be no competition, where the

collective body would be the only capitalist and would have unlimited capital and could suffer no loss to a rival, inefficiency could not be automatically penalized and ultimately eliminated, and efficiency, instead of being characteristic, would be personal, and like all traits personal, would be subject to abuse and error, an object of deceit and intrigue, a cause for dissension and strife, a prey for all the weaknesses and imperfections of human nature. Seriously to consider making any body of men the judge and final arbiter of the competency and reliability of the directors and managers of the entire process of the world's production and thus making the existence of the human race dependent upon its dictates, bespeaks for human nature and human capacity a trust and a confidence that history, experience, and right reason all forbid.

In objection to these conclusions it is urged that States and municipalities frequently engage in enterprises requiring directive ability and they do not find the difficulties suggested to be insuperable. The force of this objection, however, is only apparent. First, because competition has set the seal of efficiency upon certain persons who by what they have achieved are known to the industrial world to possess the requisite ability. Second, because competition still exists, and in its field the unfit are still being eliminated by their losses and the fit are still being marked by their achievements. As a result of these conditions, the public authorities are able to select persons of directive competency from those known to be competent and to judge of the application of their ability by their achievements as compared with the achievements of others in the competitive world. In

fine, the efficiency of the management of public enterprises is known and regulated by comparison with the outside world. But in the contemplation of Socialism we may not consider an "outside," and therefore, the successful conduct of such enterprises of the State as in rare instances have been successful, offers no solution of the difficulty,—is not a step in the direction of a solution.

Nor does a solution seem in any way possible with competition destroyed. Directive ability must be determined automatically, as at present, or it must be left to the erring, weak, not always unbiased and sometimes vicious, judgment of men to determine. Socialists condemn the existing method without reserve, but they fail to suggest, even on paper, how the other can be applied with hope or promise or intelligence; or without mistake, abuse, injustice, favoritism and oppression.

II. THE DISTRIBUTION OF GOODS

The Socialist aim with respect to the distribution of goods in Socialism is expressed in a formula adapted by Marx from Utopian writers (perhaps original with Saint-Simon): "From each according to his ability; to each according to his needs." It is said that this aim will be the governing principle of distribution from the beginning of Socialism, although it is not contended that it will be applied perfectly until the whole of society is entirely free from the "perverting" influences of existing civilization.

The formula reads well. Its application is a different matter. It calls forth three pertinent questions: (1), as to the needs of society; (2), as to the needs of each

person; (3), as to the ability of each person; — how will these be determined?

1. *As to the Needs of Society.*

The amount of goods that will be required by the whole society is of first and chief concern. It would be out of the question to ascertain the needs of each person before having provided the means to satisfy them. To satisfy one's needs, the things needed must be supplied when they are needed. If they must be made after the necessity appears, they may be entirely needless when they are furnished. In order to make the Socialist formula nearly adequate, therefore, the needs of the whole society must be anticipated.

But how can the needs of a society be anticipated? If a common dress, a common diet, a common rule of life be imposed upon its members, as in communal societies, their ordinary necessities could be calculated with mathematical nicety. And if the Socialist aim were frankly to reduce social existence to such a condition, its formula would not be impossible of application. But Socialists are the first to repudiate such an aim. They say that Socialism is not Communism and Socialisdom would not be a communal society. This makes their formula mathematically impossible because the characteristics that go to make up individuality defy mathematical calculation and the necessities they call forth cannot be estimated in advance.

If there is no mathematical solution of this problem, how, then, can it be solved? It is the opinion of some Socialists that a solution is not called for, that in Socialisdom the needs of society will continue to be met as they are now. This is not a thoughtful opinion. So-

cialism would not be Socialism if competition were admitted in its scheme. But in gauging the necessities of existing society, competition is the all-important factor. It gauges demand no less than supply. It does more than gauge, it regulates. Competition even creates demand, though it is more generally created by demand. A few years since there was no demand for "breakfast foods," but now this article of diet, thanks to competition, is in such demand that its manufacture constitutes one of the principal minor industries. The phenomenal demand for automobiles in the last decade is another instance of the creative power of competition.

But competition gives evidence of greatest influence in regulating demand. By price-cutting, advertising, and artful solicitation, by credits, premiums, discounts, rebates, special sales, clubbing plans, by every inducement and device known to modern business, the demand for goods is shifted about, stimulated, depressed, hindered, diverted or satisfied, until, through the numerous arts of competitive ingenuity, it is finally brought to correspond in a general way with supply. In this manner the needs of the whole society are fairly anticipated,—not in the sense that they are determined before they arise, but in the sense that they do not arise until they are measurably provided for.

This whole question is one of supply and demand. The demand in present society corresponds to the *needs* of society. Owing to the restraints imposed by competition, mere desire is not an appreciable factor. Desire must be coupled with willingness to pay, and willingness must be coupled with ability before there arises a demand. The aim of competition is to harmonize and bring

together the various factors that make up supply and the several elements that constitute demand. Each enterprise, each business, each trade, each person the world over, is engaged in realizing this definite aim. Each is a definite center of activity in this direction and each has a certain finality of interest within a particular sphere. But the activity of all has one general purpose and the interests of all call for one general condition,—the proportionate development of supply and demand so that neither will fall too far behind the other. The moving force is the desire for profits, but in an industrial sense the desire for profits is equivalent to the aim to bring supply and demand to their highest reach without having one to overreach the other.

In Socialisdom all this would be necessarily changed. Competition would be abrogated; profits would be impossible; ability to pay for things wanted would be out of the question. Under these conditions the needs of society or its demands would correspond with the sum of the unrestrained desires of individuals; the desires of all the members of society would be the measure of the needs of the society. Of course, none think of satisfying the desires of all; hence, one of two consequences must follow: either all of the desires of some or some of the desires of all will be satisfied. The first is Favoritism, the second Communism.

Socialists do not like to face this question squarely. They are ever ready to assert in general terms that in Socialisdom there will be such an abundance of goods that "then for the first time man will emerge from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones." But when questioned as to the How? of this splendid

proposal, they either belittle the questioner or resort to some vague owlism about the "womb of time." It is but rarely that one finds a Socialist like Sydney Webb, who exclaims: "I am appalled to see how little attention we give to questions of administration!" It is truly appalling that men of the force and character of some Socialists will seriously propose to abolish the principal institutions of society without even considering in detail what is to take their place, and worse still, deem it a mark of ignorance in another to do so.

2. *"To each according to his needs."*

But the problem of determining the needs of the whole society would be trivial in detail, compared with that of determining the needs of each individual. It is unthinkable that society could judge of the needs of each of its members. One's needs cannot be judged by one's self even in any absolute sense. If one should fix upon certain things as necessities, others are more than likely to disagree. Anything approaching uniformity of opinion in this matter is impossible to bring about; "as many men there are, so many minds there are." Nor is it merely a question of many minds, but also of many characters, occupations, tastes, talents, and gifts of health, life, and understanding. Flying machines may be a necessity for some, while even meat may not be for others. Some must have silks, satins, and jewelry, while others need but a single garment and would be unhappy if arrayed in finery. And what is a necessity for one to-day may not be a necessity for the same one to-morrow or next day. These are plain truths, which it would seem mere obstinacy to gainsay.

So, in Socialisdom, either mere desire would be the

criterion of individual needs, or else they must be fixed arbitrarily. The former, of course, is an absurd proposal. The latter is not Socialism, but Communism; that is, if the fixed needs be uniform for all persons, it is Communism, if not, it is Favoritism. But in either case, the proposal to give "to each according to his needs" is physically impossible of realization.

Considered from the standpoint of the whole society, it would not be impossible by imposing a common life on all to meet the necessities of all; but even a common life among its members would not enable society to meet the necessities of each "according to his needs," for certain needs would be peculiar to each in spite of the common rule. It is simple enough to fix the needs of all by arbitrary rule of law, but that would not suffice to meet the needs of each that, according to the nature and character of each, would still be actually necessary notwithstanding the rule fixed. Therefore it is not merely a question of Socialism or Communism, but of getting around the physical fact that the necessities of individuals differ and will continue to differ as long as the characteristics of individuality exist. They differ so widely, so variously, and with such constant and rapid change in their differences, that among large numbers of individuals it is physically impossible for any society to determine the necessities of each one.

3. *"From each according to his ability."*

How would society secure from each the contribution indicated by this formula? Granting that each would be willing to contribute according to his ability, who would be the judge of the matter? The general public cannot judge of one's ability; one person cannot judge

another's; one cannot judge for one's self even. Instances are numerous in every walk of life where all persons, one's self included, have been deceived to their sorrow in this matter. Many imagine they have ability when they have not; — but who is to say they have not until they are tried? Who is to say it even when they try and fail? Is it not failure itself that often leads to success? Many imagine they have not ability when they have, but who is to gainsay them? Even when a trial has given evidence of ability, can it be forgotten that very often success is the forerunner of failure?

But surely there is some way out of this confusion. Yes, a simple way, which is condemned by Socialism. The way is by competition. Without competition there could be no way. In every phase of social production and distribution of goods competition alone is the condition and the test of efficiency for achievement. It determines the ability of each person, the lowest as well as the highest. It determines the needs of each, the most pressing as well as the lightest. It calls forth from each the best talent, the purest taste, the highest skill, the greatest energy, the longest forbearance. It demands and secures "from each according to his ability." It checks unfounded ambition, discourages mistaken effort, represses unnecessary desire, and in this way it provides for "each according to his needs." It does not do these things to perfection, of course, but it does them as nothing else possibly can. By its proposal to do away with competition and with profits, the reward flowing from, and, therefore, the incentive to, competition, the Socialist economic aim is reduced to an impossible and ridiculous economic absurdity.

(a) *A Suggestion.*

Competition is an economic law. It is not the supreme law. Justice is higher. Charity is higher. Because it is a good thing and even a necessary thing, it does not follow that competition should suffer no restraint. Competition is the one thing necessary to achievement, but achievement at the expense of justice or charity is too expensive. All good things are abused by men, and competition is abused no less than other good things. But this is not a sufficient reason, in fact it is not a reason at all, to abolish competition. If the abuse of a good thing cannot be stopped, the fault is not in the thing but in the force brought to bear on the abuse. The fault will remain when the thing abused is abolished, and the abuse will be transferred to something else and will not be checked. That the abuse will be merely transferred to something else is certain. Anything can be abused, and ill-disposed human nature is not content unless it is abusing something. So long as human nature is human, therefore, it will be quite useless to destroy a thing in order to prevent abuse. Of course, if it is proposed to change human nature, the matter is different; but why not do that in the first place?

The abuse of competition comes principally from its being misdirected. Its true purpose is to achieve. Reward follows, not as a result of competition, but as the fruits of achievement. But competition is often perverted in its aim, and reward instead of achievement becomes its objective. This ought not to be so. Justice requires that reward follow achievement as a matter of course, and justice is violated when competition interferes with this order. True, reward is the ultimate aim

of all endeavor; the wrong lies in its being made the immediate aim. This sets up advantage instead of merit as a condition of right. For if reward is to be the immediate object of competition, then he who accomplishes the least perhaps may claim the most. By the accident of some advantage not due to merit, he may claim the fruits of another's successful endeavor and take from him his justly earned reward. This is forcibly illustrated by what in the commercial world is known as a corner in the market, when some one by a trick of trade secures control over a commodity and, without adding anything to its worth, advances its price above the common, normal, and just estimate of what is fair. This is competition for reward without achievement and though in one form or another it is not an uncommon practice in modern society it is contrary to justice. Competition for reward regardless of achievement cannot prove other than unjust.

The failure to distinguish between the right and wrong objective of competition is responsible for the errors of two well-known but widely differing schools of political economy. One is the school of Ricardo, which holds that competition is a crime and in no case should be permitted. The other is the Manchester school, which holds that it is the greatest good and in no case should be hindered. Each of these doctrines is true in part and in part false. Combining them in as much as they are true, we get the correct principle: Competition for reward without achievement is virtually robbery, but competition for achievement is a necessary condition of progress in society.

In modern society this dual principle is violated in

both of its essential aspects, and usually by the same practice. The unnatural advantage that some members of society enjoy, often makes competition with them a mere fiction. They were accorded this advantage by society's conferring upon them certain artificial powers or privileges, such as those attending upon incorporation, and the object of this was greater achievement. But this object is frequently lost to view and these privileges are used to secure greater reward regardless of achievement. Probably the most deplorable results of this misuse or abuse of society's privileges are seen in the condition of the working classes of modern times. In many instances, owing to the great advantage of the employing classes, the workers are not free to compete with them but must yield to them out of necessity. If the advantage of the employing classes were a natural advantage, the consequence would not be unjust. But it is not natural. While in the abstract labor, being equally necessary with, is as powerful a competitor as is capital, the capitalist of modern industry is usually at an advantage. This is the result of artificial conditions built up by society in the course of its growth and progress, conditions very effective toward greater achievement of the whole society, but very destructive to the competitive equality of some parts. Since society has produced these conditions, it should control them, and while it would not be the part of wisdom to abolish them, because they are advantageous, their abuse should be prevented and their evil effects counteracted as far as may be without interfering with rights that take precedence even before society's. It is clearly the duty of modern society not only itself not to abridge the freedom of

competition, but also not to suffer this to be done with means that have come about through social progress. In fine, society ought not to result in some of its members without fault being made worse off than they would be without society. This result is seen to have come about in some instances, and in those, society should interfere to correct results and should stop the abuse that effects them, if they are results of abuse, otherwise create other conditions that will counterbalance those already existing.

Owing to the close connection between reward and achievement, the principle of free competition for achievement and no competition for reward is difficult of juridical application at all times, because, first, the direction in which endeavor is aimed is often obscured, and, second, it constantly changes. Hence there is a broad field where competition even for reward must be suffered by society, not because it is just, but because it cannot be said with assurance on which side justice is violated. But where it is evident that a birthright is required for a mess of pottage, there can be no mistaking the object of competition and no difficulty in applying juridical restraint. We are unable to discern when daylight ceases and darkness begins, though we cannot mistake the extremes; by analogy, though we cannot say exactly when injustice begins to displace justice, we are not blind to all distinction between them.

These principles form the basis for the demand for a living wage that is meeting with such growing favor in nearly all countries. (The 1914 Report of the Legislative Bureau of the American Federation shows that more than a third of the States have adopted laws fix-

ing minimum wages for certain industries.) This demand is not to be confused with the demand for the Right of Subsistence, advanced by Morelly (1753), Brissot (1780), Cabet (1848), and others of Socialistic trend, nor with the doctrines of Fichte and Fourier. It is more nearly analogous to the Right to Labor mentioned by Turgot in connection with Louis XVI's famous edict relating to free labor, which was ineffectively guaranteed by the French Constitution of 1793, and the Prussian Civil Code of 1794. This demand does not grow out of charity. It is rooted in justice. It is of a character with the time-honored inhibition against usury and tends to vitalize the principle that forbids direct competition for reward. Were the relative strength of the capitalist and the laborer in modern society reversed, so that there were danger of wages being forced up to a prohibitive point, justice would then require a *maximum* wage to be fixed. This seems to have occurred when the Hundred Years' War and the Black Plague almost depopulated England of workingmen, and a maximum wage was accordingly fixed by the Statute of Laborers (23 Edw. III), which probably is the first instance of English legislation on this subject. And signs are not wanting that indicate a recurrence of conditions that may call for a fixed maximum wage. But in view of existing conditions, though the growing force of labor organizations and the tendency on the part of the State toward greater interference may change the present advantage of the employer over the employed, there seems in justice no reason against fixing a minimum wage in those industries where a living wage is uncertain.

With the question of maximum interest and minimum

wage regulation should be classed the less agitated but no less important question of maximum rent. Excepting the Irish Land Act (44 Vic. 49), which suppressed rack-renting, there appears to be no English legislation specifically regulating rent. In fact, there seems to have been no agitation for such regulation, though the *abrogation* of rent has been urged with much frequency by the proponents of various schemes of land nationalization. (Cf. Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, Alfred Wallace's *Land Nationalization*, Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics*, and the older writings of Thomas, especially, *The Meridian Sun*.) Rent-usury, as clearly as wage-usury, is of a kind with loan-usury. It is difficult to perceive the justice of requiring mobile capital to be hired at restricted rates, as in prohibiting usurious interest, and at the same time permitting fixed capital to be hired at unrestricted rates as in renting. Prior to the elaborate systems of property insurance now in vogue and when methods of conserving or redeeming land by cultivation were unknown, the difference in the risk of letting money and of letting land was eminently great. (It is surprising that this difference is overlooked by Menger, who, in his *Right to the Whole Produce of Labor*, places the two squarely on the same footing, criticising both State and Church—the latter fervently—for their practice in distinguishing between them in the past.) And owing to the wear and tear on landed improvements, which is both unavoidable and uninsurable, some difference should still be allowed. But with this allowance made, though there is just reason for a somewhat higher rate of rent than of interest, there appears no reason in justice against a fixed maximum for

both. Of course, this does not apply to rent paid in kind, known as share-renting, after the French economists called the *metayer* system, which is widely practiced by agricultural tenantry. In such cases the owner joins the user in assuming the risks incident to production, thus creating a relation analogous to a business partnership wherein one partner furnishes the capital and the other conducts the enterprise. In such cases a fixed maximum return for the capital obviously would be unjust.

In addition to wages, interest, and rent, there are two other important forms of reward that result from achievement. Rent and interest are the fruits of previous achievement; wages, the fruits of concurrent achievement. The other two forms are dividends and profits. These are the fruits of previous and concurrent achievement combined. The Dutch economist, Melon, writing in 1734, classes dividends with rents and both with interest. This view is adopted by Sidgwick and approved by Devas. On the other hand, the Liberal school of economists classifies dividends with interest and both with rents. Thus, though Conservative and Liberal each has a distinct classification for dividends, both claim for this form of reward, as for rent and interest, the character of "unearned income." Still more inclusive is the classification of Socialist writers, who, following Marx, perceive no difference in rent, interest, dividends, and profit, but class all of them as forms of "surplus value."

Notwithstanding its able exponents, however, the view that dividends are of a character with interest or rents is of doubtful accuracy. They seem more correctly classi-

fied with profits. Dividends and profits are produced by the capital invested in a business. They can be produced by that particular capital alone. True, labor contributes to their production, but it is hired labor, to which the business is in justice required to pay a fair wage or salary whether it succeeds or fails. The capital assumes all the risk and the labor none. While in any event the labor employed gets the return of a fair wage, if nothing is achieved in the business, the capital gets no reward. This is as it should be. On the contrary, interests and rents are not necessarily produced by the business in which the capital they pay for is used; they must be paid though their use prove entirely unprofitable. The capital, instead of labor, is hired in this case. It is entitled to a just return in interest or rents, but no more. It is entitled to that much even though nothing be achieved through its use. But it is entitled to no more, however much may be achieved thereby. Since it will be paid for in any event, it takes no risks, therefore, more than a fair return should not be paid for it in the event of success.

The fruits of achievement must go to him who undertakes and carries out the project in hand, be he a capitalist who hires labor, or a laborer who hires capital. He must pay a fair price for what he hires, in wages, interest or rents. He is justly entitled to the balance in dividends and profits. The only question bearing on the amount of dividends or profits that may be justly taken by the mover of a successful enterprise is the justice of the wage, the interest or the rents that he pays for the factors he hires. While this question, as a rule, is to be determined by bargaining and agreement, there are

certain limits beyond which terms should not be allowed, because they are plainly so unjust that none would *freely* agree to them, and the agreement is secured only by reason of the extreme necessity of the injured party. Here society should interpose its restraining authority to prevent one from taking advantage of the necessity of another to force the terms of an unfair and harsh bargain. Society should not interfere too soon, however, or assume to go farther than necessity demands; for that would defeat the very purpose of its action by interfering with the freedom of the individual.

The whole problem of social justice is rooted in the principle of free competition for achievement and no competition for reward, either for the reward being earned, or for that previously earned. This principle ordinarily must look to the moral conscience for its application, but in extreme cases it can be applied juridically and should then be vitalized by the State through its laws fixing the minimum or maximum of wages, interests, and rents, as occasion requires. The common estimate of what is fair, which normally prevails in a community, is usually a safe criterion for the distribution of reward. By carefully observing it, by scorning all efforts to evade it, by requiring others to measure up to it in their dealings and invoking the aid of society when they plainly do not or certainly will not,—these broad rules of conduct will insure the greatest measure of justice that is possible in society. They will not bring about equality of possessions; they will not prevent one from becoming very rich, or another very poor. Justice is in no proper sense an equalizing principle. It admits of the greatest disparity of possessions. It requires such disparity. It re-

quires a disparity of possessions that corresponds to the general disparity of natural gifts, talents, all-round competency and fitness that exists in all phases of life. Such disparity is rooted in human nature, and it would be stultifying and highly unjust to prevent it from producing a corresponding disparity in the possession of things provided for this same human nature. It is where this disparity is artificial and not natural, privileged and not merited, that a corresponding disparity of possessions violates justice. But, obviously, this cannot be in competency in the field of achievement. For there, competency must be real in order to achieve. The power to hinder the achievement of others, to reap the fruits of their achievement, may be artificial, but the power to achieve is nothing if not real. Hence, in the freedom of competition for achievement, and in the restraint of competition for reward, we have the whole law of social justice in the production and distribution of goods.

There is another principle affecting the matter of distributing goods that requires more than justice. Bare justice would give no relief to those members of society who through affliction or infirmity are not able to achieve anything. Charity must come to their assistance. The law of charity is as imperative on occasion as the law of justice, and binding on society no less than on individuals. The inherent dignity of the human person requires that all other considerations shall give way to the preservation of human life. In the essentials that make a human being human, there is no difference between the fit and the unfit. Until he has forfeited his life by wrong doing even the most lowly and the most feeble has a right to live before the most exalted and the most

powerful can rightly claim more than a living. It is the teaching of all reliable moralists that the right of each person to hold as his own the fruits of his achievement is sacred and inviolable. But it is not without obligations, individual and social. The needs of society, and the demands of charity, constitute a first mortgage, as it were, upon the possessions of each person that exceed his proper subsistence. This principle is most admirably set forth in Leo XIII's famous encyclical letter on "The Condition of the Working Classes," which perhaps is the most profound treatise of modern times on this subject. Speaking in the Imperial Parliament, in 1884, Bismarck said: "Give the laborer the right to work in health, care for him when sick, and pension him when old." Here is justice supplemented by charity,—the same thought coming to the great Chancellor and the great Pope, the two most remarkable men of their century. Nothing less than irresistible truth could bring together on one point the minds of two men of their surpassing powers, when they were so widely apart in every other respect.

Very few societies in history have altogether disowned this triune principle of distribution according to justice, necessity, and charity; and the few that have, have come to certain and usually sudden disaster. Sparta perhaps is the most notable example of this retributive fate. Sparta ignored justice and despised charity and in consequence, notwithstanding she practiced cruel ingenuity to develop her citizenry, the cause of her downfall, as summed up by Aristotle in four words, was "the want of men." On the other hand, under the dominance of the Fourth Estate in France, though charity was over-

done, justice was disregarded, and in consequence France was like to have suffered the fate that was later to befall Poland, when the genius of the "Little Corporal" set up an antidotal régime that knew no law but blood and iron. Among the numerous American communities established during the last century by various Socialist sects, there was a common practice of violating justice by diverting the natural course of reward, which by their rules was conditioned on advantage instead of achievement—and of these communities there remains nothing but fragmentary history.

Thus history holds out no encouragement for those who think of abolishing charity or of denying justice in society. It holds out none for those who would substitute advantage for merit in the distribution of goods. It holds out none for those who would suffer competition for reward or hinder competition for achievement.

NOTE.—As indicated in the *Preface*, the author is now preparing a study of social problems, which will more fully analyse the province and duty of the State in respect to existing economic inequalities. This book may be expected to issue during the coming year (1916).—ED.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

STATEMENT

I. VALUE

Considered as a whole, it cannot fail to be remarked that, while it seriously and vitally affects our entire civilization by both its criticisms and its proposals, Socialism in the main is an economic movement. Its indictment of present society rests almost entirely upon its teaching that, economically speaking, every social institution and ideal is constituted into a system of exploitation and robbery. Its philosophy makes economic conditions serve as the sole condition and determinant of human consciousness. Its moral teaching rests upon its doctrine of economic determinism, as supplemented by its theory of a class-struggle between economic classes. Its proposals, however they would overthrow the whole order of social existence, are confined in the last analysis to a change of economic conditions. This summary, therefore, fulfills its purpose with an outline of the principles and aims of Socialist economics and the chief objections to be urged against them.

The Socialist conception of value is comprehended in the single idea that it is an exchange characteristic. It is peculiar to commodities. It is determined by labor, the only measurable thing that is common alike in all commodities. Not by actual labor, however, but by "so-

cial labor," which is the sum of human effort spent in producing commodities,—not actually spent, but "on the average necessary."

II. SURPLUS VALUE

This is the product of labor that is spent after the cost of the labor-power is produced. The laborer sells his labor-power at its cost, *i.e.*, for an equivalent of the "necessities" consumed in developing that power. The capitalist uses the power not only till it produces what it cost, but as long as is physically possible. Thus, the capitalist gets the benefit of labor for which he has not paid. Surplus value is the product of unpaid labor. In modern society it amounts to about eighty per cent. of the total product. The capitalists get eighty per cent., the laborers twenty, though the latter produce the whole.

III. THE CLASS STRUGGLE

From this conception of surplus value it is plain that the capitalists live and thrive by robbing the laborers, while the laborers barely live by resisting the capitalists to their utmost. The conflict between them is inherent and deadly. The laborers have numbers on their side, but despite numbers they steadily lose, because the capitalists have organization,—religion, State, family, school, press, public opinion and, at the root of all, private property,—all of which go to systematize the robbery of the common labor of mankind.

IV. THE SYSTEM

The system works as follows: the capitalists own the instruments of production and distribution. In order to

live, the laborers must use these instruments, and the owners of them require the laborers to pay a tribute for their use. All of the institutions of civilization support the capitalists in this ownership, and affirm their right to the tribute. This is what social institutions were made for. Religion holds out to the patient laborer a heavenly crown for his submission and his enforced poverty, the State threatens the rebellious laborer with punishment for violating the laws of property, the school and the press combine to deceive the workers, and public opinion fills them with fear, doubt, and despair.

V. THE REMEDY

To remedy this, the ownership of property must be brought to correspond with its use. It must be prescribed that, while each person has a right to own whatever he himself uses, no person has a right to own what another person uses, and what is collectively used must be collectively owned. Especially is this true of the means of production, distribution, and exchange; but it is also true of any property by virtue of ownership in which one person might use the labor-power of another to profit. Not only must property that is collectively used be collectively owned, but it must also be collectively operated. In fine, "The buying and selling of labor must come to an end." "The making of goods for profit must come to an end." Commodities must be produced with an eye single to their use, and exchange must be based on value determined by labor. This plan will immediately check, and finally destroy, all avarice and greed among men. It will dispense with the necessity for all laws relating to property and for most laws

relating to crime. It will cause the State to die out, since it exists only for the protection of the dominant economic class, and then there would be no economic classes. It will destroy the family because there will be no occasion for one to know his offspring so as to leave it property, which alone is the reason for marriage. This plan would result in a wonderful industrial growth and marvelous educational advancement; the work of the entire world would come to be performed by machinery, and the machinery would be operated by the touch of a button; there would be a plentiful abundance of goods for all persons, and all would have rest and leisure, and artists and scientists and scholars would abound in countless numbers. This would destroy forever the fantastic notion of a heaven hereafter and establish in its stead the knowledge of a real paradise here. Religion would then be but a painful memory reminding man of the time when he was striving after false ideals while he yielded up all means of attaining the true.

REFUTATION

(1)

The root fallacy of the teachings thus outlined is found in the assumption that equal values are received and demanded in the course of exchange. This necessitates a measure of value in order to strike an equation; this calls for a sort of common denominator in commodities, which is labor. But in truth, exchange takes place only when values are unequal. Both parties to every exchange demand and believe they receive a greater value than they relinquish by the exchange. It is this

alone that induces the exchange. Value, considered solely as an exchange characteristic, has no meaning. Considered in any other sense, except as synonymous with price, it is undeterminable on any basis and impossible to gauge or measure by any means.

(II)

Value not being measurable or determinable, there is no such thing as surplus value. Before there can be said to be a surplus there must be a plenty, and before there can be said to be a plenty, there must be a comparison of standards of some kind. Eliminating the matter of price, there is no standard of exchange. There could not be one when both parties to an exchange demand and think they receive more than they give by the exchange. It is plain, therefore, that the idea of surplus value is purely imaginary. Moreover, it is impossible to say, even approximately, how much any person produces by just his own labor. Considering labor-power independently of the means furnished the laborer by capital (which, being the product of labor expended by another than the instant laborer, the latter of course cannot justly claim the product of), it is doubtful if any person in modern society produces as much as he consumes.

(III)

The value and surplus-value theories being exploded, the class-struggle theory is without support. It had no support anyhow. Both labor and capital are required to produce value. Both enter into the production of every commodity, although the proportion of their re-

spective contributions to the product cannot in any instance be determined. It requires both capital and labor to make profits; and they should divide the profits, as they have divided them since the beginning. True, it seems this division has not always been just in the past, neither is it so now, nor will it ever be so, if we consider particular instances. But whether on the whole either capital or labor has got more than its share is impossible to say or to think, for the proportion of their respective contributions to production, distribution, and exchange cannot be imagined, much less determined. That injustice is systematically worked by the capitalists does not follow from the fact that they own the instruments of wealth. It may be worked with equal facility by the laborers because they own the driving power of those instruments. There are instances where the capitalists plainly work injustice. There are instances where the laborers as plainly do so. These are the extremes, and they can be regulated; but short of that, regulation by arbitrary rule would defeat justice rather than promote it. For these reasons there can be no class struggle in the sense predicated by Socialist teaching. But a plainer reason still why there is no class-struggle between capitalists and workingmen is that all workers are capitalists, and all capitalists are workers. There are but few in society who do not work and from whose work some one else does not realize a profit. This is true of all classes. Within each class one profits by the assistance of another. Indeed, one profits by the labor of another, while the other is at the same time profiting by the labor of the first. Mutual assistance

rather than class-struggle is the law of application in social activity.

(IV)

The systematized robbery imagined by the Socialists is purely imaginary. It rests on the class struggle theory, which rests on the surplus-value theory, which rests on the value theory, which rests on the assumption that equal values are normally exchanged, which is an inherent contradiction. These theories are all linked together, and they all fall through the fallacy of the assumption that equal values are normally exchanged.

(v)

The remedy proposed, if a remedy were needed in the sense proposed,—not as a reform but as a new society,—is impossible. It is not possible even to work it out on paper. How will the public acquire the property necessary to prevent persons from buying and selling labor-power? It could not be purchased because there is not money enough. It could not be confiscated because the capitalists own all the instruments and agencies for making war. And if the public by chance acquired the property, it could not operate it. No collective body could effect a division of labor that would carry on industry on its present scale. Labor could not be collectively directed so that the present efficiency of industry would be maintained. The product could not be gauged so as to produce just enough to satisfy the needs of society. Nor could the needs of society be known. It is impossible to say Who wants What, when there are mil-

lions of people to consider. Finally, there is no way of inducing men to work long and arduously for mere amusement. If one who does not work fares as well as one who does, the latter will speedily find excuse not to work: there must be an incentive for all endeavor. There would be none in Socialism except for eating and drinking and making merry.

It is no answer to these objections to say that whatever can be done in present society, can be done just as well, if not better, in the society proposed. Competition governs industry nowadays. It enters into the workings of business, profession, trade, life at all points. It requires of each person that he do his best always, and if that is not good enough he must give way for one who can do better. It automatically eliminates the unfit, whether a capitalist or a workingman, an employer or an employe. It is inexorable in its dictate that only the fittest shall survive. It is not a moral law. The good are not rewarded nor the bad made to suffer through competition. He is willfully blind who does not see numerous instances of hardship suffered by one of the best intentions and, too, for no other reason than that competition has singled him out for some particular in which he is not quite so apt as his fellow, albeit his fellow is at heart wholly undeserving. But competition is a law of efficiency. It is a condition of progress and achievement. It has brought the business of the world to, and now sustains it at, the highest point of efficiency known to man; and without competition, society has no method and can devise none whereby that high point can be maintained. It is eminently fitting that competition in

society be regulated wherever it is misdirected and plainly works injustice; but it ought not to be, and, indeed, it may be said with assurance that, as long as human nature is human, it cannot be abrogated.

AUTHORITIES

- Abbott,
 Industrial Democracy.
 Rights of Man.
- Adams,
 Economic Supremacy.
- Aristotle,
 Politics.
- Augustine,
 City of God.
- Bacon,
 New Atlantis.
- Bakounin,
 God and the State.
- Bascom,
 Sociology.
- Bax,
 Essays in Socialism.
 Ethics of Socialism.
 Religion of Socialism.
 Short History of the Commune.
 Universal History from a Socialist Standpoint.
- Bax and Morris,
 Growth and Outcome of Socialism.
- Bebel,
 Glossen.

Usurle.

Woman.

Bellamy,

Looking Backward.

Benham,

Proletarian Revolt.

Bernstein,

Evolutionary Socialism.

Lasalle as a Social Reformer.

Blatchford,

God and My Neighbor.

Industrial Marriages.

Merrie England.

Not Guilty (a Novel).

Bliss,

Encyclopædia of Social Reforms.

Blassard,

The Ethics of Usury and Interest.

Bohn and Haywood,

Industrial Socialism.

Brinton,

The Basis of Social Relations.

Brooks,

Social Unrest.

Brown,

The Advance.

The Social Crusader, July, 1901.

Socialism and Primitive Christianity.

Buckle,

History of Civilization.

- Burrowes,
 International Socialist Review, Jan., 1902.
- Campenella,
 City of the Sun.
- Carlyle,
 French Revolution.
- Cicero,
 Republic.
- Clark,
 The Distribution of Wealth.
- Clodd,
 Childhood of the World.
- Cunningham,
 Modern Civilization—Its Economic Aspects.
- Daily Socialist (Chicago), May 4, 1900.
- Dante,
 Monarchy Daily People, June 5, 1905.
- Davidson,
 The Annals of Toil.
- Dawson,
 Lasalle and German Socialism.
 Bismarck and State.
- Debs,
 International Socialist Review, Jan., 1912.
 International Socialist Review, Feb., 1912.
 Life Writings and Speeches.
- DeTunzlemann,
 The Superstition Called Socialism.
- DeMorgan,
 Budget of Paradoxes.

Deville,

Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism.

Deville,

State and Socialism.

Dietzgen,

Outcome of Philosophy.

Philosophical Essays.

Draper,

The European Age of Faith.

Eltzbacher,

Anarchism.

Ely,

Political Economy.

Socialism in Modern Times.

Socialism and Social Reform.

Erfurt Program (Adopted at Erfurt, 1891, a revision of the Gotha Program).

Engels,

Duerhing.

Feuerbach.

Origin of the Family, the State and Private Property.

Socialism Utopian and Scientific.

Speech at Grave of Marx.

Ferri,

Socialism and Modern Science.

Fiske,

Destiny of Man.

Outline of Cosmic Philosophy.

The Idea of God.

Flint,

Socialism.

- Franklin,
Socialization of Humanity, International Socialist Review, Nov., 1904.
- Ghent,
Mass and Class.
- Gibbens,
Industry in England.
- Gilman,
Woman and Economics.
- Godwin,
Political Justice.
- Golstein,
Socialism.
- Gotha Program (adopted 1875 over protest of Marx to certain particulars which were changed to meet his views in the Erfurt Program).
- Graham,
Socialism New and Old.
- Guides,
Political Economy.
- Guizot,
History of England.
Memoirs.
- Gumplowicz,
Outlines of Sociology.
- Guthrie,
Socialism before the French Revolution.
- Hadley,
Economics.

Hale,

Man Without a Country.

Harrington,

Oceana.

Haywood,

"Cooper Union Speech," International Socialist Review,
Feb., 1902.

Haywood and Bohn,

Industrial Socialism.

Hegel,

Philosophy of History.

Herron,

International Socialist Review, Jan., 1901.

Appeal to Reason, May 16, 1903.

Metropolitan, May, 1903.

Metropolitan, Aug., 1913.

Revolution to Revolution.

The Socialist Spirit, Jan., 1903.

The Workers, March, 1902.

The Wage Slave, July, 1908.

Why I Am a Socialist.

Hillis,

A Man's Value to Society.

Hillquit,

Socialism in Theory and Practice.

Socialism Summed Up.

History of Socialism in United States.

Hinds,

American Communities.

Hobbes,

Leviathan.

Homer,
Odyssey.

Hopkins,
Wealth and Waste.

Hunter,
Poverty.

Hughan,
American Socialism of the Present Day.

Hyndman,
Historical Basis of Socialism.
Economics of Socialism.
Socialism and Society.

Jaures,
Studies in Socialism.

Jenks,
Great Fortunes.

Jenons,
Theory of Political Economy.

Kauffman,
What Is Socialism?

Kautsky,
Communism in Central Europe.
Die Neue Zeit, Oct. 27, 1911.
Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History.
Road to Power.
Social Revolution.
The Social Revolution.

Kelly,
Twentieth Century Socialism.

Kerr,

Folly of Being Good.
Morals and Socialism.

Kidd,

Social Evolution.

Kirkup,

A History of Socialism.

Kohler,

Social Democracy.

Kropotkin,

Field, Factories and Workshops.
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.
Mutual Aid.
The Conquest of Bread.

Labriola,

Materialistic Conception of History.

Ladoff,

International Socialist Review, Feb., 1905.
International Socialist Review, June, 1908.
The Passing of Capitalism.

Lafargue,

Evolution of Private Property.
Evolution of Property.
Right to be Lazy.
Philosophic Studies.

LaMonte,

International Socialist Review, Feb., 1912.
Man vs. The Man (Published correspondence between
LaMonte and H. L. Mencker, non-Socialist).
Socialism, Positive and Negative.

- Lambert,
 Notes on Ingersoll.
- Lassalle,
 Science and the Workingman.
 The Workingman's Programme.
- Laughline,
 Political Economy.
- Lavelleye,
 Socialism of To-day.
- Leatham,
 Socialism and Character.
- Lecky,
 Democracy and Liberty.
 History of Rationalism in Europe.
- Leo XIII,
 Immortali Deo (Encyclical).
- Le Rossingol,
 Orthodox Socialism.
- Lewis,
 The Militant Proletariat.
 Evolution: Social and Organic.
- Liebkeenncht,
 No Compromise.
 Karl Marx.
 Socialism.
- Locke,
 Civil Government.
- Loria,
 Economic Foundation of Society.

London,

Address to the Yale Students, 1906.
Iron Heel (a Novel).

MacDonald,

Socialism and Positive Science.

Mackenzie,

Introduction to Social Philosophy.

Maine,

Ancient Law.

Mallock,

A Critical Examination of Socialism.
The Case Against Socialism.

Mann,

Import and Outlook of Socialism.

Marshall,

Present Position of Economics.
Principles of Economics.

Marx,

Capital.
Critique of Political Economy.
The Holy Family.
The Poverty of Philosophy.
Value, Price and Profit.
Wage-Labor and Capital.

Massart and Vandervelde,

Parasitism Organic and Social.

Menger,

The Right to the Whole Product of Labor.

Mills,

Political Economy.

- More,
Utopia.
- Morelly,
Basiliade.
Code de la Nature.
- Morgan,
Ancient Society.
- Morris,
Useful Work vs. Useless Toil.
News from Nowhere (a Novel).
- Morris and Bax,
Growth and Outcome of Socialism.
- Most,
Freiheit.
- O'Neal,
The Worker, Dec. 2, 1905.
- Osborne,
Principles of Economics.
- Owen,
A New View of Society.
- Parce,
Economic Interpretation of History.
Lessons in Economics.
- Paulsen,
A System of Ethics.
- Plato,
Critias.
Law.
Protagoras.
Republic.

Timæus.

The Statesman.

Plechanoff,

Anarchy and Socialism.

Plutarch,

Lycurgus.

Proudhon,

What Is Property?

Rae,

Contemporary Socialism.

Reeve,

The Cost of Competition.

Ricardo,

Principles of Political Economy.

Richardson,

Industrial Problems.

Rogers,

Economic Interpretation of History.

Six Centuries of Work and Wages.

Work and Wages.

Rousseau,

The Social Contract.

Ruskin,

Political Economy and Art.

Unto This Last.

Saures,

Defensio Fidei.

Schaeffle,

The Quintessence of Socialism.

The Impossibility of Social Democracy.

Seligman,

The Economic Interpretation of History.

Shaw,

Municipal Government in Continental Europe.

Simon,

International Socialist Review, Dec., 1900.

International Socialist Review, June, 1904.

Philosophy of Socialism.

Socialism and Anarchism.

Skelton,

Socialism; A Critical Analysis.

Smith,

Wealth of Nations.

Socialist Campaign Book, 1908, also, 1912.

Socialist Democrat, Aug. 15, 1903.

Social Democrat of Milwaukee, Oct. 12, 1904.

Sombart,

Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century.

Spargo,

Appeal to Reason, May 16, 1903.

Bitter Cry of the Children.

Common Sense of Socialism.

His Life and Work.

Socialism.

The Comrade, May, 1903.

The Socialists, Who They Are and What They Stand For.

The Substance of Socialism.
Where We Stand.

Sprague,
Socialism from Genesis to Revelation.

Stern,
"Thesen."

Stoddart,
The New Socialism.

Strobell,
A Christian View of Socialism.
The Call, March 15, 1909.
The Call, March 2, 1911.
The Chicago Socialist, July 11, 1903.
The Commonweal, Vol. 4, No. 137.
The People, Feb. 8, 1900.
The Social Democrat, March 15, 1903.

Thompson,
Constructive Programme of Socialism.
Inquiry into Distribution of Wealth.

Tolstoi,
My Confession.
What to Do.

Towler,
Socialism and Social Government.

Tucker,
Instead of a Book.

Uhlhorn,
Christian Charity in the Ancient Church.

- Untermann,
International Socialist Review, Aug., 1904.
Science and Revolution.
- Vail,
Principles of Scientific Socialism.
Socialist Movement.
- Veblen,
Theory of Business Enterprise.
- Villiers,
The Socialist Movement in England.
Volkszeitung, Sept. 9, 1901.
- Walker,
Land and Its Rent.
- Walling,
Socialism as It Is.
- Ward,
Dynamic Sociology.
Pure Sociology.
- Webb,
Problems of Modern Industry.
Industrial Democracy.
- Wells,
Socialist Democracy (The Great State).
New Worlds of Old.
- Wilson,
The Menace of Socialism.
- Wiltshire,
Why a Woman Should Be a Socialist.

INDEX

INDEX

- Ability, directive, how judged, 275
- Abrogation of capital, Socialist aim, 12
- Abolition of profits, Socialist platform, 14
- Achievement of French Revolution, lack of, 181
- A classless society, Socialism, 119
- Aim of Competition, 269
- Aim of Socialism, as an economic movement, 246
 - as a political movement, 229
 - as a thought movement, 219
 - in economics, 12
 - in Morals, 226
 - in Philosophy, 219
 - in Religion, 223
- Alliance of passions of unrest, 172
- Analysis of Socialist Philosophy, 46
- Ancient laws, 100
- Ancient states, 101
- Antagonisms of society, 123
- Aristotle and Plato, compared, 139
- Artificial and natural social classes, 117
- "Atlantis," 102
- As conspirators, Socialists, 106
- Attitude of Socialism toward State, 93
- Attitude of Socialist Party, toward labor unions, 211
 - toward religion, 212
 - toward use of violence, 214
- Atheism of Socialism, 49
- Atheism, spread of, 166
- Atheists, 99 per cent. Socialists are, 50
- Anthropology, 32
- Authority and power distinguished, 88
- Authority, source of, 87
- Aveling's tour of United States, 207
- Back-to-the-brute Aim of Socialism, 224
- Bakounin, Socialist "insurgent," 190
- Basis of Civilization, unification not conflict, 24
- Basis of exchange, real, 15
 - in Socialist economics, 16
- Basis, of living wage, 281
 - of Morality, 70
- "Beautiful" revolutionary temperament, 109
- Bebel's division of labor, 257
- Bellamy's division of labor, 258
- Bernstein, leader of Revisionists, 158
- Biology, 32
- Bismarck and Leo XIII, 287
- Bitterness of Socialists toward Christianity, 58
- Bond of Socialists is Sentiment, 162
- "Brazil" of ancient lore, 102
- Breton city of Is, 102
- Campanella and More, compared, 146

- Campanella and Plato, compared, 146
- Capital, defined, 24
fixed and mobile, interest on, 282
necessity of conserving by due return, 24
- Capitalists all workers, 296
- Cause of business failures, 268
- Charity, in social life, 186
necessity for, 25
obligation to do, 286
- Charondas, 135
- Christian ideals, how weakened, 166
- Christian theory of the universe, 36
- Christianity and Socialism contrasted, 63
- Christianity held "servile," 55
- Church-land insurrection, 183
- Civil authority, defined, 87
- Civil Law, defined, 100
- Civil *power*, source of, 91
- Civilization, its necessary norms, 25
- Class-conscious doctrine, 119
- Class-consciousness, defined, 119
- Classes in Society, 116
- Classes, none in Socialism, 100
- Class-Struggle, defined, 10
its history, 11
its promise, 12
- Coherency of Socialist thought fatal, 14
- Collective *operation* of industry, 254
- Collective Ownership, defined, 13
- Commands of Moral law (Socialist), 82
- Comment on Methods of acquisition proposed, 251
- Commodity, what is, 3
- Communism of Plato, 136
- Communities of Socialists in United States, 203
- Competition, a curse (Socialist theory), 26
an economic law, 276
norm of civilization, 25
operation of, 268
regulates demand, 272
- Competitive method of public acquisition, 247
- Conclusion and summary, 291
- Confiscation method of public acquisition, 246
- Conflict between capital and labor, Socialist theory, 11
- Conspirators, Socialists are, when, 106
- Content of Socialist philosophy, 30
- Contrast in effects of Christianity and Socialism, 65
- Contrast of Socialism, with natural religion, 60
with supernatural, 61
with Christianity, 63
- Cosmology, 32
- Craft Guilds, 153
- Creation, in light of science, 37
- Criticism of Socialist Aims, 232
- Darwinism, 29
- Debs, Eugene V., leader of Socialists in United States, 209
- Definitions of Socialism, iii
- De Leon, leader of Socialist Labor Party, 208
- Demand as regulated, by desire, 274
by competition, 272
- Democracy of suffering, 164
- Description of Platonic ideal, 137
- Dialectic — Materialistic — Monism, 47
- Dialectic Method in philosophy, 27

- Direction of Labor in Socialism, 263
- Directivity in industry, necessity for, 263
 - how judged, 264
- Discontent, as a social force, 163
 - growth of, 164
 - philosophy of, 166
- Discontented classes, Socialism
 - asylum for, 125
- Distribution of Goods, 170
- Dividends, how produced, 284
- Division of labor in Socialism, 256
- Doctrine of class-consciousness, 121
- Doctrine of envy, 128
- Dreams of Socialists, III

- Early Syndicalism in England, 185
- Economic aim of Socialism, 254
- Economic determinism, defined, 40
- Economic Interpretation of History, 45
- Economic theories of Marx, source, 153
- Efficiency, how determined, 268
 - test of, 276
- Elizabethan Poor Laws, 153
- Enclosure acts of England, 163
- End of Man, Christian concept, 70
 - Socialist concept, 71
- England, Socialist parties in, 198
- Envy a Socialist sentiment, 128
- Envy as a social force, 169
- Epitome, of Marxian philosophy, 32
 - of Socialist view of history, 230
- Equivalents only exchanged (Socialist theory), 3
- Equivalents never exchanged (true theory), 15
- Error judged by truth, 71
- Ethics, defined, 67
 - distinguished from morals, 67
- Evolution, Hegel's teaching of, 27
- Evolution of man, Socialist teaching, 40
- Evolution, represented by spiral (?), 30
- Evolutionary materialistic monism, 32
- Excesses of French Revolution, 179
- Exchange Characteristic, what is, I
- Exchange, real basis of, 15
 - Socialist basis of, 16
- Extinction of capitalists, Socialist aim, 12

- Fabian Society, 199
- Factories, what to be socialized, 245
- Failures in business, cause of, 268
- Family in Socialism, 234
- Fanciful visions of Socialists, 255
- Fatalism of Socialist philosophy, 70
- Favoritism or Communism, 270
- Feuerbach, materialist, 30
- First principles denied by Socialist philosophy, 29
- Forbearance a virtue of slavery, 55
- Force without law, 100
- Foreign sentiment among Socialists, 175
- Freedom of speech and press, not Socialistic, 162
- Free love in Socialism, 84

- Free Will a condition of morality, 68
 denied by Socialists, 67
 French Revolution, first stage, 178
 lack of achievement of, 181
 Proletarian stage, 179
- Genesis, in light of science, 37
 German Socialist parties, 193
 God alone Unlimited, 112
 Godlessness of Socialism, 49
 Goodness and Morality distinguished, 68
 Goods, Distribution of, 270
 Gorky's tour of United States, 210
 Gratuitous service, defined, 6
 Greed as a social force, 169
 Growth of Socialist Sentiment, 163
 Guilds of Middle Ages, 153
- Hardie, Keir, labor leader, 199
 Harrington, as foreshadowing Socialist Idea, 150
 as suggesting "Land Nationalization," 149
 "Single Tax," 149
 compared with More and Plato, 148
- Haves and Have-Nots, 173
 Hegel, philosophy of, 27
 Heritage of civilization from the French Revolution, 169
 Herron-Rand affair, 210
 Hippodamus, 135
 Historical Materialism, 45
 History, of national Socialist parties, 193
 of human race, Socialist, 41
 of "The International," 188
 of Paris Commune, 189
 of Socialist Movement, 178
 of Socialist Sentiment, 163
 History, Socialist division of, 42
- How Competition regulates efficiency, 268
 How labor will be divided in Socialism, 256
 How Socialists define religion, 59
 How Socialists war on society, 231
 How the public will acquire the property to be socialized, 246
 How will labor be directed?, 263
 Human nature, Socialists do not change, xii
 Humanitarianism, 52
 Humility a virtue of *slavery*, 55
- Idea of Socialism (Scientific), 151
 Ideal politic, The, 102
 Idealism rejected by Socialists, 29
 Impossible and impracticable distinguished, xiii
 Inconsistency of Socialists, 227
 Individual accountability denied, 70
 Individual needs, how determined, 274
 Industry, how operated in Socialism, 254
 Interference of State in regulating wages, 284
 International, The, history of, 188
 "Is," lost Breton city, 102
- Justice in Social Life, 286
 Justice, norm of civilization, 25
- Kant, disputed first principles, 28
 Kinds of Socialism, viii
- Labor, defined, 24
 determined value, 3

- Labor, direction of in socialism, 263
- division of in socialism, 256
- how much required for production, 17
- includes manual labor, 5
- excludes "waste" labor (q. v.), 5
- excludes "gratuitous" service (q. v.), 5
- Labor-power, cost of producing, 19
- distinguished from labor, 6
- Labor, social defined, 5
- Labor-units of skilled and unskilled compared, 7
- Lassalle, founder Working-man's Party (Germany), 193
- Land Nationalization (Wallace), suggested by Harrington, 149
- Land, what to be socialized, 243
- Law, none in *Socialism*, 100
- Law without force, 100
- Lawlessness, as a social force, 169
- Lawlessness of Socialist leaders, 105
- Loyalty, 102
- Leo XIII and Bismarck, 287
- Liebknecht's tour of United States, 207
- Luddites, destroyers of machinery, 187
- Limitations of man, 112
- Limitlessness of the Limitator, 112
- Living wage, basis of, 280
- Lycurgus, 135
- Machinery, its part in production, 17
- early destruction of, 185
- what to be socialized, 245
- Many Kinds of Socialism, viii
- Man's relation to society, 91
- Marx and More, compared, 151
- Marx, career from 1841 to 1864, 186
- Marx's theories, source, 154
- Marxian Darwinism, 40
- Marxian formula of value, 3
- Materialism of Feuerbach, 30
- Materialistic conception of History, 45
- Maximum interest,—rent,—wage, 281
- Meekness a virtue of *slavery*, 55
- Metayer* system, 282
- Method, of Socialist philosophy, 27
- of Hegelian School, 27
- Methods, of propaganda, Marxian, 156
- pre-Marxian, 155
- Methods, Socialist, of acquiring our industries, 246
- Competition, 247
- Confiscation, 246
- Pension, 248
- Purchase, 250
- Middle Age Craft Guilds, ix
- Mills, what to be socialized, 245
- Mines, what to be socialized, 243
- Minimum wage, 281
- Misfortune's appeal to mankind, 164
- Modification of Socialist Idea, 160
- Monism, evolutionary materialistic, 32
- Monistic Materialism, 30
- Moral basis impossible without God, 68
- Moral ideas not fixed (Socialist view), 76
- Moral Law of Socialism, 81
- Moral principle of Socialism, 67
- Morality, basis of, 70

- Morality, distinguished from goodness, 68
 impossible without free will, 68
 Morality, of future Society, (Socialist view), 82
 of past Society (Socialist view), 77
 of present Society (Socialist view), 75
 Morality, Socialist concept of, 73
 Morals distinguished from ethics, 67
 More and Campanella, compared, 146
 More and Plato, compared, 144
 More, Harrington and Plato, 148
 More and Marx, compared, 151
 Most, John, organized second "International," 192
 Movement of Socialism, 178
 in Germany, 193
 in England, 198
 Murder in Socialism, 84
 National Parties, Socialist, 193
 Natural and artificial social classes, 117
 Natural religion, 60
 Natural rights denied by Socialists, 75
 Necessity for charity, 286
 Necessity for *direction* of labor, 263
 Needs of individuals, 274
 Needs of Society, 270
 Nihilism as a social force, 175
 Nineteenth Century evolutionism, 33
 Ninety-nine per cent. of Socialists atheists, 50
 Objective of competition, 277
 Object of "The International," 187
 Objections, to Socialist economics, 15
 to Socialist theory of the universe, 35
Oceana, described, 252
 Operation of Industry, 254
 Operation of State-owned industries, 269
 Opportunist Socialists, 160
 Ownership and operation, difference, 254
 Ownership, collective, aim of Socialist economics, 12
 Panic, of 1873, 205
 of 1893, 209
 Paradise of Socialists in this world, 65
 Parable of The Master and His Vineyard, 131
 Paradox of Marx's explanation of profits, vii
 Paris Commune, 107
 Pension method of public acquisition, 248
 Philolaus, 135
 Philosophy of Socialism, method, 27
 opposed to free will, 68
 summary of, 46
 Plato, 135
 Plato and revelation, 142
 Plato, The Radical, 140
 Plato's admission of impracticability, 138
 Plato's difficulty with truth, 141
 Plato and Aristotle, compared, 139
 Plato and More, compared, 144
 Plato, More and Harrington, 148
 Platonic idea in Socialism, 135
 Platonic view of society, 136
 Pliny's ecstasy (*Oceana*), 149
 Plug Riots (of England), 185
 Political perfection, 102
 Political principle, 87

- Political theories of Marx,
 source, 154
 Poor laws (Elizabethan), 153
 Power and Authority distinguished, 91
 Practical Socialism, lack of
 Idea in, 161
 Press, freedom of not a Socialist doctrine, 161
 Printing, a help to Discontent, 163
 Private property, necessity for, 25
 Problem of social justice, 285
 Product, what is, 3
 Profits, how produced, 283
 Progress in society, xviii
 Proletarian class, defined, 123
 Proletariat and Socialism inseparable, 120
 Promise of Socialism, 116
 Property, a crime (Socialist economics), 26
 Property the public should own, 238
 Property, what to be socialized, 238
 Public acquisition of property, 246
 by Competition, 247
 by Confiscation, 246
 by Pension, 242
 by Purchase, 250
 Public operation of industry, 169
 Public ownership, what it includes, 238
 Purchase method of public acquisition, 250
 Purity and Socialism, 84
 Radicalism of 18th Century, 166
 Railroads, what to be socialized, 244
 Reconstruction as a Socialist aim, 236
 Reign of Terror, 180
 Relations of sexes in Socialism, 84
 Refutation of Socialist economics, 204
 Refutation of Socialist theories, 15
 Religion, as a civilizing force, 168
 as a bar to civilization, 55
 as a "servile" institution, 55
 Religion and Socialism Contrasted, 60
 Religion, defined, 49
 Religion devised by capitalists, 54
 Religion only chloroforms workers, 55
 Religious principle of Socialism, 49
 Rent-usury, 282
 Requirements of Charity, 286
 Revealed (supernatural) religion, 61
 Revisionist Socialists, 158
 Revisionism merely negative, 159
 Revolution as a Socialist aim, 229
 Revolution of 1830, 184
 Revolution, French, 178
 Right to Labor (Marx), 153
 Right to Labor (Turgot), 281
 Right to Subsistence (Marx), 153
 Right to Subsistence (Morelly, etc.), 281
 Right to Whole Produce of Labor, 154
 Robbery of Workingmen, the means, 10
 the system, 292
 Root fallacy of Socialist economics, 15
 Root of Socialist Philosophy, value, 3

- Sacrifice of Christian and Socialist compared, 66
 Sacrifice, motive of, 66
 Scientific truth of Creation, 38
 Sentiment the bond of Socialists, 162
 Sentiments of Socialists that are foreign to Socialism, 175
 Sexual Morality in Socialism, 84
 Share-renting, 282
 Single Tax (George) suggested by Harrington, 149
 Skilled labor, not reckoned by Socialists, 6
 Speech, freedom of not a Socialist doctrine, 176
 Sobriety in Socialism, 88
 Social Classes, 116
 Social interests determine morality, 74
 Social justice, problem of, 285
 Social Labor, defined, 3
Socialism, defined, xii
 described, 111
 Socialism, atheistic, 49
 atheistic humanism, 52
 a revolution, not a reform, ix
 essential aims of, xiv
 in England, 201
 in France, 201
 in Germany, 201
 in United States, 203
 leads to atheism, 50
 malicious toward religion, 57
 intends to root out God, 50
 is practically impossible, xvi
 suggested in Utopia, 145
 "Summed up," v
 the Nihilism of, xv
 varieties of, viii
 what is, iii
 Socialism, would destroy the State, 96
 Socialist abundance, 255
 Socialist Communities in United States, 203
 Socialist concept, of Man's end, 71
 of Morality, 73
 Socialist definitions, of Religion, 59
 of State, 93
 Socialist "dyed-in-the-wool," iv
 Socialist "election expediency," iv
 Socialist disrespect for law, 108
 Socialist divisions of history, 42
 Socialist dreams, 111
 Socialist economics makes property a crime, 26
 Socialist economics, refuted, 15
 unjust, 18
 Socialist Idea, as an ideal, 150
 foreshadowed by Harrington, 150
 Socialist Idea (Platonic), 137
 (Practical), 159
 (Utopian), 142
 present tendency, 158
 (Scientific), 151
 Socialist Lawlessness, 103
 Socialist methods of acquiring
 our industries, 246
 by Competition, 247
 by Confiscation, 246
 by Pension, 248
 by Purchase, 250
 Socialist Moral law, as to worship of God, 83
 in reference to theft, 83
 regarding murder, 84
 touching sex relations, 84
 Socialist Movement, 178
 Socialist paradise in this life, 65
 Socialist parties, of Germany, 193
 in England, 198
 in United States, 213
 Socialist Party of the United States formation, 210

- Socialist Party of the U. S., attitude toward labor unions, 211
- toward religion, 212
- toward use of violence, 214
- Socialist philosophy, analysed, 46
 - conformed to Hegelian teaching, 28
 - its content, 30
 - its method, 27
 - opposed to free will, 68
 - summarized, 46
- Socialist proposals a contradiction, xiii
- Socialist Sentiment, analysed, 163
 - history of, 163
 - the bond of Socialists, 162
- Socialist tactics, xvi
- Socialist theory of the universe, 34
- Socialists as conspirators against United States, 106
- Socialists, who are, viii
- Sociality, defined, 114
 - distinguished from Morality, 114
 - from politics, 114
- Society and classes, 116
- Society, an organism (Socialist view), 71
- Society as an organism, 138
- Society in relation to man (Socialist view), 91
- Society, needs of, 271
- Society, progress of, xvi
- Society, Socialist definition, 71
- Source, of Civil Authority, 87
 - of Civil power, 91
 - of Marxism, 154
 - of Platonic teaching, 135
- Spirit of 1848, 173
- Spoliation of Church lands, 183
- State-owned industries, operation of, 269
- State regulation of wages, 284
- State Socialism, conflicting views on, ix
- Statute of Laborers, 281
- Steamboats, what to be socialized, 244
- "Suicide" of the State, 96
- Suffering, democracy of, 164
- Summary and Conclusion, 291
- Summary of Socialist philosophy, 46
- Supernatural religion, 61
- Surplus-Value, defined, 8
 - equals profits, interest, divided, rent, 7
 - product of unpaid labor, 7
 - the beginning of Socialist knowledge, 8
- Surplus-value theory a mere bogey, 20
- Sylvis, Wm., leader National Labor Union, 205
- Tactics, of Marx and Engles, 156
 - of pre-Marxian Socialists, 155
 - of present-day Socialists, 105
- Teaching of Plato, 135
- Telegraph and telephone lines, what to be socialized, 244
- Temperance in Socialism, 85
- Test of efficiency, 276
- Test of error, 71
- Test of Socialist adherence, ix
- The collectivist theory a fatality, 25
- The "days" of Creation, 37
- The Limitator of the universe, 112
- The law and a law distinguished, 110
- The State, 91
- The State in Socialism, 97
- The State's "demise," 96
- Theft in Socialism, 84

- Theism rejected by Socialists, 29
- Theist concept of Man's end, 70
- Theory of Class-consciousness, 119
- Theory of Class-Struggle, defined, 10
 - the motive of Socialist propaganda, 12
 - requires the extinction of capitalists, 12
 - necessitates collective ownership (q. v.), 12
- Theory of Collective Ownership, 13
- Theory of Exchange analysed, 15
- Theory of the Universe, 32
- Third Estate in French Revolution, 178
- Thiers on Robespierre, 180
- Thrift in Socialism, 85
- Truth and error, test of, 71
- Truth in its own objectivity, vi
- Truth not judged by error, 71
- Utopia, 142
 - as suggesting Socialism, 145
- Utopian Society, 143
- United States, Socialist Communities in, 203
- Socialist Parties in, 203
- Unpaid Labor, source of surplus-value, 10
- Value, root of Socialist Philosophy, 3
 - determined by labor, 3
 - does not include "utility," 3
- Value, Marxian formula of, 3
- Variation, represented by circle, 30
- Varieties of Socialism, viii
- Visions and fancies of Socialists, 255
- Vollmar, leader of Revisionists, 196
- Wages, detriment to raise (Socialist theory), 128
- Wage-usury, 282
- Wages, not a just reward for labor, ix
 - increase of a detriment to workers, ix
- Wages, State regulation of, 284
- Waste-Labor, defined, 5
- Well's view of Socialist tyranny, 266
- What are necessities, 274
- What is Socialism*, iii
- What is not Socialism, x
- What shall the public own, 238
- What Socialist moral does not command, 83
- When competition is right and when wrong, 278
- Whence the moral law, 81
- Who will do the "dirty work," 256
- Why good men are socialists, 225
- Workers all capitalists, 296
- "Yom" used by Moses for "day," 38
- "Young" Socialists, 295

C.1

Stanford University Libraries



3 6105 037 033 656

HX
86
.E45

[illegible]

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA
94305

